

Missing No. 12 + 18
21 & 28 March 81



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

25
4

सं० 1] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जनवरी 3, 1981/पौष 13, 1902
No. 1] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JANUARY 3, 1981/PAUSA 13, 1902

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate paglog is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्यक्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर)

केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities (other than the
Administrations of Union Territories)

विधि, न्याय और कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय

(विधि कार्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 1 सितम्बर, 1980

सूचना

का० भा० 1.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री भगवती प्रसाद एडवोकेट उदयपुर, राजस्थान ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे उदयपुर में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

2. उक्त व्यक्ति की नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(60)/80-न्या०]

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY
AFFAIRS

(Department of Legal Affairs)

New Delhi, the 1st September, 1980

NOTICE

S.O. 1.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said authority, under

1074 GI/80

rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Bhagwati Prasad, Advocate, Udaipur, Rajasthan for appointment as a Notary to practise in Udaipur.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. F. 5(60)/80-Judl]

नई दिल्ली, 17 दिसम्बर, 1980

सूचना

का० भा० 2.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री डी० एम० मिश्रा एडवोकेट, 328 गुरु रामदास नगर (लक्ष्मी नगर), दिल्ली-92 ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे नई दिल्ली/दिल्ली में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

2. उक्त व्यक्ति की नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(82)/80-न्या०]

एस० गुप्ता, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th December, 1980

NOTICE

S.O. 2.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said rules by Shri D. N. Mishra, Advocate 328 Guru Ram Das Nagar (Laxmi Nagar) Delhi-92 for appointment as a Notary to practice in New Delhi/Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within 14 days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. F. 5(82)/80-Judl.]

S. GOOPTU, Competent Authority.

गृह मंत्रालय

(कार्मिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 19 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० भा० 3.—बण्ड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उप-धारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्द्वारा, गोहाटी उच्च न्यायालय, गोहाटी में श्री बी० एन० हजारीका तथा अन्यो के विरुद्ध दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना नियमित मामला संख्या 23/72-सी० आई० यू० (पी) से उत्पन्न अभियुक्त व्यक्तियों द्वारा बायर प्रापराधिक पुनरीक्षण याचिकाओं के संचालन के लिए श्री जी० के० तालुकवार, बरिष्ठ अधिवक्ता गोहाटी, उच्च न्यायालय को विशेष शोक अधियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० 225/70/80-ए० बी० डी०-2]

टी० के० सुब्रमणियन, धवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

(Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms)

New Delhi, the 19th December, 1980

S.O. 3.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of Section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri G. K. Talukdar, Senior Advocate, Gauhati High Court, Gauhati, as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the Criminal revision petitions filed by the accused persons arising out of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Regular case No. R. C. 23/72-CIU(P) against Shri B. N. Hazarika and others, in the Gauhati High Court, Gauhati.

[No. 225/70/80-A.V.D.-II]

T. K. SUBRAMANIAN, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 15 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० भा० 4.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 के उपबंध इस अधिसूचना के भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से, 23 मार्च, 1983 तक की अवधि के लिए कोल्हापुर जिला मध्यवर्ती सहकारी बैंक, लि० पर वहां तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहां तक इनका संबंध इस बैंक द्वारा गैर-बैंकिंग अस्ति अर्थात् पनोरी तालुका राधानगरी, जिला कोल्हापुर में निम्नलिखित अमीन जामजाव की धारिता से है।

सर्वे नं०

एकड़ गुन्ता

(1) सर्वे नं० 129	1—19
(2) सर्वे नं० 134	5—7
(3) सर्वे नं० 164	8—10
(4) सर्वे नं० 165	8—12

[सं० एक० 8/52/80-ए० सी०]

इन्द्रानी सेन, धवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 15th December, 1980

S.O. 4.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of Section 9 of the said Act shall not apply to the Kolhapur District Central Co-operative Bank Ltd., Kolhapur so far as they relate to its holding of non-banking assets viz. undernoted landed property at Panori, Taluka Radhanagari, District Kolhapur.

Survey No.	Acres Gunthas
(1) Survey No. 129	1—19
(2) -do- 134	5—7
(3) -do- 164	8—10
(4) -do- 165	8—12

for the period from the date of publication of this notification in the Gazette of India to 23rd March, 1983.

[No. F. 8/52/80-AC]

INDRANI SEN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 19 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० भा० 5.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा (2) के उपबन्धों से नेशनल बैंक आफ पाकिस्तान, कलकत्ता तथा हबीब बैंक लिमिटेड, बम्बई को 19 दिसम्बर 1970 के का० भा० 3949 के अन्तर्गत दी गई छूट को एक और वर्ष की अवधि के लिए 31 दिसम्बर, 1981 तक बढ़ाते हैं।

[संख्या 15(33)-बी० ओ०-111/78]

एन० डी० बत्रा, धवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th December, 1980

S.O. 5.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, extends for a further period of one year till the 31st December, 1981, the exemption granted in S. O. 3949 dated the 19th December, 1970 to the National Bank of Pakistan, Calcutta and the Habib Bank Ltd., Bombay from the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 11 of the said Act

[No. 15(33)-B.O. 111/78]

N. D. BATRA, Under Secy

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सीमा शुल्क समाहृत का कार्यालय

मदुरई, 22 अक्टूबर, 1980

का० आ० 6.—केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क नियम, 1944 के नियम 5 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं एतद्वारा इस समाहृतिय के साक्ष्य जागी करने वाले प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् रेंजों के प्रभारी केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधीक्षकों की अपने संबंधित अधिकार क्षेत्र में जहाँ उत्पाद शुल्क माल का उत्पादन, संपादन या निर्माण या उस से संबंधित परिवर्तनों को निरीक्षण करने एवं अनुमोदन करने के लिए, उक्त नियम के नियम 9(1) में निहित समाहर्ता की शक्तियों को प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करता हूँ।

[सं सी ई आर 5/80/सी० सं० 4/16/173/80-के० उ० शु० 2]

श्री० जयारामन, समाहर्ता

OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE

Madurai, the 22nd October, 1980

S.O. 6.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me under rule 5 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, I hereby authorise the licensing authorities, namely, Superintendents of Central Excise in charge of Ranges in this Collectorate to exercise in their respective jurisdiction, the powers of the Collector, under Rule 9(1) of the said Rule for specifying and approving the place where excisable goods are produced, cured or manufactured or premises appurtenant thereto.

[CER. 5/80-C. No. IV/16/173/80-CX.II]

R. JAYARAMAN, Collector

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क और सीमा-शुल्क बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 27 दिसम्बर, 1980

सीमा-शुल्क

का० आ० 7.—केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क और सीमा-शुल्क बोर्ड, सीमा-शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 9 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में मथुरा परिष्करण (रिफाइनरी) को भाण्डागार स्टेशन के रूप में घोषित करना है।

[अधि० सं० 242/का० सं० 473/88/80-सी० शु०-7]

आनन्द छाबड़ा, सचिव

CENTRAL BOARD OF EXCISE AND CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 27th December, 1980

CUSTOMS

S.O. 7.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Board of Excise and Customs hereby declares Mathura Refinery in the State of Uttar Pradesh to be a warehousing station.

[Ntfn. No. 242/F. No. 473/88/80-Cus. VII]

A. K. CHHABRA, Secy.

सीमा तथा केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, कार्यालय

बंगलौर, 15 दिसम्बर, 1980

सीमाशुल्क

का० आ० 8 —1962 के सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम की धारा 8(ख) के अन्तर्गत, समाहर्ता सीमाशुल्क को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, तथा इस कार्यालय के दिनांक 10-1-77 की अधिसूचना संख्या 1/77 सीमाशुल्क सी० सं० 8/48/199/75 सी० शु० का अधिक्षमण करते हुए, मैं, रवीन्द्रनाथ शुक्ल, समाहर्ता सीमा तथा केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क

बंगलौर इस अधिसूचना द्वारा बंगलौर हवाई अड्डे (वायु पत्तन) के सम्बन्ध में निम्नलिखित स्थानों को सीमाशुल्क क्षेत्र के रूप में विनिर्दिष्ट करता हूँ।

(1) हवाई अड्डे का संपूर्ण इलाका एराड्रोम जिसका माप उत्तर से दक्षिण तक 701—04 मीटर, और पूर्व से पश्चिम तक 4124 मीटर है तथा जिसमें टर्मिनल कम्प्लेक्स जिसका माप 51800 वर्ग मीटर, हवाई भूड्डा, कन्ट्रोल टावर, रन वे, टर्नेक, पार्किंग बेस, एयरलाइन्स के कार्यालय बिल्डिंग, तेल संस्थान तथा अन्य इमारतें भी शामिल हैं, निम्नलिखित स्थानों से घिरा हुआ है :—

दक्षिण में :— छल्लाघट्टा गांव, एन० ए० एस० रोड, बेल्लुंदर टैंक एन० ए० एस० बिल्डिंग्स कंपाउंड और येमलूर गांव हैं।

उत्तर में :— मुरुगेश पाल्या, कोनेनग्रहारा गांव, एविएशन मेडिकल स्कूल, एन० ए० एस० फीटरी, बिल्डिंग 26 एयर फोर्स डिपो और बंगलौर बरधुर रोड से घिरा है।

पूर्व में :— मार्गहल्लि गांव से घिरा है।

पश्चिम में :— छल्लाघट्टा टैंक

(2) एयर फार्गो केम्पलैक्स जो एम० एस० आर्डी० एन० होस में, एयर पोर्ट में बूरी पर है जिसका माप 2,900 वर्ग मीटर होता है, सर्वे नं० 3/4, कानेना-अग्रहार गांव, बंगलौर दक्षिण तालुक में है, निम्नलिखित स्थानों से घिरा है :—

उत्तर में :— टिप्पा रेड्डी की भूमि

दक्षिण में :— पटेल बसप्पा की भूमि

पूर्व में :— एविएशन मेडिसिन की संस्था, रक्षा मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार।

पश्चिम में :— सर्विस रोड।

[अधिसूचना सं० 3/80(सीमाशुल्क)/सी० सं० 8/48/257/80-सी०-2/सीमाशुल्क]

रवीन्द्रनाथ शुक्ल, समाहर्ता

OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE AND CUSTOMS

Bangalore, the 15th December, 1980

CUSTOMS

S.O. 8.—In exercise of the powers conferred upon the Collector of Customs under section 8(b) of the Customs Act, 1962, and in supersession of this office Notification No. 1/77 Customs C. No. VIII/48/199/75-Cus. Dated 10-1-77, I, R.N. Shukla, Collector of Central Excise and Customs, Bangalore hereby specify the Customs area in respect of Bangalore Air Port as under :—

(1) The whole of the Aerodrome Area measuring North to South 701—04 Mts., East to West 4124 Mts., including the terminal complex measuring 51800 Sq. m., Air Port, Control Tower, Runways, the tramac, parking bays, Airline offices, buildings, oil installations and all structures bounded by the following :—

SOUTH : By Challaghatta Village, NAL Road, Bellunder Tank, NAL Buildings, Kempapura Village, Yemlur Village :

NORTH : By Murugeshapalya, Konenagrahara Village, School of Aviation Medicine, H A.L. Factory Buildings, 26 Air Force Depot and Bangalore—Varthur Road;

EAST : By Marthahalli Village;

WEST : By Challaghatta Tank;

(2) The Air Cargo Complex situated in the M.S.I.L. House situated on the Airport Road, 1/2 K.M. from the Air Port measuring 2,900 sq. mts. at Survey No. 3/4, Konena Agrahara Village, Bangalore South Taluk, bounded by the following : —

NORTH : Tippa Reddy's Land

SOUTH : Patel Basappa's Land

EAST : Institute of Aviation Medicine, Ministry of Defence, Government of India.

WEST : Service Road.

[Notification No. 3/80 (Customs)/C. No. VIII/48/257/80 C2/Cus.]

R. N. SHUKLA, Collector

(आयकर आयुक्त कार्यालय, हरियाणा)

रोहतक, 19 दिसम्बर, 1980

आयकर

का० आ० 9.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक तथा समीचीन है कि वित्तीय वर्ष 1979-80 के दौरान यहाँ हमके पश्चात् विनिश्चित ऐसे सभी करदाताओं के

i) जो व्यक्ति अथवा हिन्दू अधिभक्त कुटुम्ब है, जिनकी आय दो लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है, तथा

(ii) जो फर्म, कम्पनियाँ, अथवा अन्य व्यक्ति संगम हैं, जिनकी आय वस लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है।

नाम तथा उनसे सम्बन्धित अन्य विशिष्टियाँ प्रकाशित की जाएँ और यतः आयकर अधिनियम, (1961 का 43) की धारा 287 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों तथा इस निमित्त उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने आदेश दिनांक 10 अगस्त, 1977 के द्वारा सभी आयकर आयुक्तों को वित्तीय वर्ष 1979-80 के दौरान उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र के भीतर (स्थित) करदाताओं से सम्बन्धित, नाम, पते, हैसियत तथा कर निर्धारण वर्ष तथा ऐसे करदाताओं द्वारा विवरणित आय, निर्धारित आय, देय कर तथा दिए गए कर को प्रकाशित करने के लिए प्राधिकृत किया है।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा दिनांक 10 अगस्त, 1977 के पूर्वोक्त आदेश द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं, इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में उपर्युक्त करदाताओं के नाम तथा अन्य विशिष्टियाँ एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करता हूँ।

आयकर विभाग हरियाणा

ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों तथा हिन्दू अधिभक्त कुटुम्बों के नाम जिनकी आय वित्तीय वर्ष 1979-80 के दौरान दो लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है तथा सभी फर्मों, व्यक्ति-संगम तथा कम्पनियों के नाम जिनकी आय वस लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है :—

(1) हैसियत के लिए है :—'आई' व्यष्टि के लिए 'एच' हिन्दू अधिभक्त परिवार के लिए 'सी' कम्पनी के लिए 'एफ' फर्म के लिए, 'ए' ए० प्रो० पी० के लिए (2) कर निर्धारण वर्ष के लिए (3) दी गई आय विवरणी के लिए (4) निर्धारित आय के लिए (5) दिए जाने वाले कर के लिए है (6) किए गए कर के लिए है।

1. पोरीट्स एण्ड स्पेंसर (यू० के०), फरीदाबाद (1) 'सी' (2) 1979-80 (3) रु० 10,44,870 (4) रु० 10,44,870 (5) रु० 2,61,217 (6) रु० 2,61,217

2. पोरीट्स एण्ड स्पेंसर (एशिया) लिमिटेड, फरीदाबाद (1) 'सी' (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 26,07,750 (4) रु० 52,64,947 (5) रु० 30,36,891 (6) रु० 27,75,646

3. मैमर्ज सरस्वती इण्डस्ट्रीयल सिन्डीकेट लिमिटेड, यमुनानगर (1) 'सी' (2) 1977-78 (3) 2,65,01,410 (4) रु० 2,61,05,200 (5) रु० 1,50,75,753 (6) रु० 1,50,75,753।

4. श्री एस० सी० अस्ता, मार्फत मैमर्ज धुंगरमल अमरवस्व, यमुना-नगर (1) 'आई' (2) 1976-77 (3) रु० 3,79,530 (4) रु० 4,05,070 (5) 2,88,463 (6) रु० 2,14,756।

5. श्रीमति निर्मल कान्ता महाजन, मार्फत महाजन ओवरसीज, जी० टी० रोड, पानीपत (1) 'आई' (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 2,35,197 (4) रु० 2,40,950 (5) रु० 1,36,150 (6) रु० 1,36,150।

6. श्री विश्वनाथ मार्फत राज बुलेन इण्डस्ट्रीज, पानीपत (1) 'आई' (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 2,38,030 (4) रु० 2,44,000 (5) रु० 1,38,160 (6) रु० 1,38,160।

7. मैमर्ज वसुन्धरानाथ मार्फत दीपक बुलेन मिक्स, पानीपत (1) 'आई' (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 3,03,795 (4) रु० 3,27,940 (5) रु० 1,93,560 (6) रु० 1,93,560।

8. श्री अशोक राज नाथ मार्फत दीपक बुलेन मिक्स, पानीपत (1) 'आई' (2) 1978-79 (3) रु० 1,68,728 (4) रु० 2,41,240 (5) रु० 1,45,295 (6) रु० 1,405,295।

9. श्री अशोक राज नाथ मार्फत दीपक बुलेन मिक्स, पानीपत (1) 'आई' (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 4,61,350 (4) रु० 4,93,200 (5) रु० 3,02,632 (6) रु० 3,02,632।

10. श्री दीपक राज नाथ मार्फत राज बुलेन इण्डस्ट्रीज, पानीपत (1) 'आई' (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 2,85,590 (4) रु० 2,99,350 (5) रु० 1,75,050 (6) 1,75,050।

11. श्री राजेश्वर नाथ मार्फत राज बुलेन इण्डस्ट्रीज, पानीपत (1) 'आई' (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 5,88,150 (4) रु० 6,20,180 (5) रु० 3,86,439 (6) रु० 3,86,439।

12. श्रीमती कमल सरोज, महाजन हाऊस, पानीपत (1) 'आई' (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 1,79,150 (4) रु० 2,10,510 (5) रु० 1,16,056 (6) रु० 1,16,056।

13. श्री विश्वनाथ मार्फत राज बुलेन इण्डस्ट्रीज, पानीपत (1) 'आई' (2) 1978-79 (3) रु० 2,78,170 (4) रु० 3,24,520 (5) रु० 1,99,998 (6) 1,99,998।

14. मिस्टन साइकिल इण्डस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड, सोनीपत (1) 'सी' (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 30,80,300 (4) रु० 31,13,260 (5) रु० 19,61,354 (6) रु० 19,61,354।

15. पानीपत को-ऑपरेटिव सुगर मिक्स, लिमिटेड, पानीपत (1) 'ए' (2) 1975-76 (3) रु० 10,29,162 (4) रु० 17,84,800 (5) रु० 7,80,912 (6) रु० 7,80,912।

16. राज बुलेन इण्डस्ट्रीज, पानीपत (1) 'एफ' (2) 1978-79 (3) रु० 8,98,540 (4) 10,61,720 (5) रु० 2,79,518 (6) रु० 2,79,518।

[का० सं० 418(1)/79-80/सुधालय]

टी० आर० अग्रवाल, आयकर आयुक्त

(Office of the Commissioner of Income Tax, Haryana)

Rohtak, the 19th December, 1980

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 9.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that it is necessary and expedient in the public interest to publish the names and other particulars hereinafter specified relating to assesseees :—

- (i) being individual, or Hindu undivided families, who have been assessed on an income of more than two lakhs of rupees, and
- (ii) being firms, companies, or other association of persons, who have been assessed on an income of more than ten lakhs of rupees, during the financial year, 1979-80.

And whereas in exercise of the powers conferred by section 287 of the Income-tax Act (43 of 1961), and all other powers enabling them in this behalf, the Central Govt. has by its order dated 10th August, 1977, authorised all Commissioners of Income tax to publish the names, addresses, status and assessment year, relating to assesseees within their jurisdiction and the income returned by, the income assessed on, the payable by, and the tax paid by, such assesseees during the financial year 1979-80.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the Central Government by its aforesaid order dated 10th August, 1977, I hereby publish in the schedule, hereto annexed the names and other particulars of the assesseees aforesaid.

INCOME TAX DEPARTMENT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Names of all individuals, and Hindu Undivided Families assessed on an income of more than Rs. two lakhs, and of all firms, Association of persons and companies assessed on an income of more than Rs. ten lakhs during the financial year 1979-80. (i) is for Status, 'I' for individual, 'H' for Hindu Undivided Family, 'C' for Company, 'F' for Firm, 'A' for A.O.P.; (ii) for assessment year; (iii) for income returned, (iv) for income assessed (v) for tax payable; and (vi) for tax paid.

1. Porritts & Spencer (U.K.), Faridabad (i) 'C' (ii) 1979-80 (iii) Rs. 10,44,870/- (iv) Rs. 10,44,870/- (v) Rs. 2,61,217/- (vi) Rs. 2,61,217/-.
2. Porritts and Spencer (Asia) Ltd., Faridabad (i) 'C' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 26,07,750/- (iv) Rs. 52,64,947/- (v) Rs. 30,36,891/- (vi) Rs. 27,75,646/-.
3. M/s. Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Ltd. Yamunanagar (i) 'C' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 2,65,01,410/- (iv) Rs. 2,61,05,200/- (v) Rs. 1,50,75,753/- (vi) Rs. 1,50,75,753/-.
4. Shri S.C. Banta c/o M/s. Ghungar Mal Amar Chand, Yamunanagar (i) 'P' (ii) 1976-77 (iii) Rs. 3,79,530/- (iv) Rs. 4,05,070/- (v) Rs. 2,88,463/- (vi) Rs. 2,14,756/-.
5. Smt. Nirmal Kanta Mahajan, C/o Mahajan Overseas, G.T. Road, Panipat (i) 'I' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 2,35,197/- (iv) 2,40,950/- (v) Rs. 1,36,150/- (vi) Rs. 1,36,150/-.
6. Sh. Vishwa Nath c/o Raj Woollen Inds., Panipat (i) 'I' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 2,38,030/- (iv) Rs. 2,44,000/- (v) Rs. 1,38,160/- (vi) Rs. 1,38,160/-.
7. Mrs. Vasundara Nath c/o Deepak Woollen Mills, Panipat (i) 'I' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 3,03,795/- (iv) Rs. 3,27,940/- (v) Rs. 1,93,560/- (vi) Rs. 1,93,560/-.
8. Shri Ashok Raj Nath c/o Deepak Woollen Mills, Panipat (i) 'I' (ii) 1978-79 (iii) Rs. 1,68,726/- (iv) Rs. 2,45,240/- (v) Rs. 1,45,295/- (vi) Rs. 1,45,295/-.
9. Shri Ashok Raj Nath c/o Deepak Wollen Mills, Panipat. (i) 'I' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 4,61,350/- (iv) Rs. 4,93,200/- (v) Rs. 3,02,632/- (vi) Rs. 3,02,632/-.

10. Sh. Deepak Raj Nath c/o Raj Woollen Industries, Panipat (i) 'I' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 2,85,590/- (iv) Rs. 2,99,350/- (v) Rs. 1,75,050/- (vi) Rs. 1,75,050/-.

11. Shri Rajeshwar Nath c/o Raj Woollen Industries, Panipat. (i) 'I' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 5,88,150/- (iv) Rs. 6,20,180/- (v) Rs. 3,86,439/- (vi) Rs. 3,86,439/-.

12. Smt. Kamal Saroj, Mahajan House, Panipat (i) 'I' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 1,79,150/- (iv) Rs. 2,10,510/- (v) Rs. 1,16,056/- (vi) Rs. 1,16,056/-.

13. Shri Vishwa Nath, C/o Raj Woollen Industries, Panipat (i) 'I' (ii) 1978-79 (iii) Rs. 2,78,170/- (iv) Rs. 3,24,520/- (v) Rs. 1,99,998/- (vi) Rs. 1,99,998/-.

14. Milton Cycle Industries Ltd., Sonapat (i) 'C' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 30,80,300/- (iv) Rs. 31,13,260/- (v) Rs. 19,61,354/- (vi) Rs. 19,61,354/-.

15. Panipat Co-operative Sugar Mills Ltd. Panipat (i) 'A' (ii) 1975-76 (iii) Rs. 10,29,162/- (iv) Rs. 17,84,800/- (v) 7,80,912/- (vi) Rs. 7,80,912/-.

16. Raj Woollen Industries, Panipat (i) 'F' (ii) 1978-79 (iii) Rs. 8,98,540/- (iv) Rs. 10,61,720/- (v) Rs. 2,79,518/- (vi) Rs. 2,79,518/-.

[F. No. 418(1)/79-80/HG].

T. R. AGGARWAL, Commissioner of Income-Tax

वार्णिज्य मंत्रालय

(वार्णिज्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 27 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० आ० 10.—केन्द्रीय सरकार नियमित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, वायु संपीड़क का नियमित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम वायु संपीड़क का नियमित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रयुक्त होंगे।

2. वायु संपीड़क का नियमित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“6. निरीक्षण फीस—नियामकता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी:

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्मित के लिए प्रति परीक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोट पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परीक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्मित के लिए प्रति परीक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोट पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(ii) उन विनिर्माता नियामकताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संसदित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परीक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।”

[सं० 6(9) 80-नि०नि० तथा नि०उ०]

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Department of Commerce)

New Delhi, the 27th December, 1980

S.O. 10.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Air Compressors (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1974, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Air Compressors (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Air Compressors (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1974, for rule 6, the following rule shall be substituted namely :—

"6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 2502 dated 21-9-1974

का० आ० 11.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, आटोमोबाइल के पुर्जों, संघटकों तथा उपसंघटकों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1973 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम आटोमोबाइल के पुर्जों, संघटकों तथा उपसंघटकों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

- (2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. आटोमोबाइल के पुर्जों, संघटकों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1973 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"6. निरीक्षण फीस—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेवणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (ii) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास सशु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।"

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 459, तारीख 17-2-1973

S.O. 11.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Automobile Spares, Components and Accessories (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1973 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Automobile Spares, Components and Accessories (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Automobile Spares, Components and Accessories (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1973, for rule 6, the following rule shall be substituted namely :—

"6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 459 dated 17-2-1973

का० आ० 12.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, साइकिलों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम साइकिलों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

- (2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. साइकिलों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेवणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (ii) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास सशु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।"

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 4357, तारीख 5-12-1967

S.O. 12.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Bicycles (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules,* 1967, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Bicycles (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Bicycles (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

“7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories”.

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 4357, dated 4-12-1967

का० आ० 13 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, चमकदार इस्पात की छड़ों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1973 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम चमकदार इस्पात की छड़ों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. चमकदार इस्पात की छड़ों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1973 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“6. निरीक्षण फीस—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निर्यात निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर है।

(ii) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 1622 तारीख 9-6-1973

S.O. 13.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Bright Steel Bars (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules,* 1973, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Bright Steel Bars (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Bright Steel Bars (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1973, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

“6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories”.

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 1622, dated 9-6-1973.

का० आ० 14 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, बसे हुए लोहे के मलनाल तथा फिटिंग्स का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1971 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम बसे हुए लोहे के मलनाल तथा फिटिंग्स का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. बसे हुए लोहे के मलनाल तथा फिटिंग्स का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1971 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“6 निरीक्षण फीस—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(ii) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 1916 तारीख 6-5-1971

S.O. 14—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Cast Iron Soil Pipes and Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1971 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Cast Iron Soil Pipes and Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Export of Cast Iron Soil Pipes and Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1971, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

“6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories.”

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 1916, dated 6-5-1971.

का० आ० 15 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (स्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, बने हुए लोहे के मैनहोल कवर तथा फ्रेम का निर्यात (स्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1971 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम बने हुए लोहे के मैनहोल कवर फ्रेम का निर्यात (स्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. बने हुए लोहे के मैनहोल कवर तथा फ्रेम का निर्यात (स्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1971 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“6 निरीक्षण फीस—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान स्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (ii) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 2155, तारीख 28-5-1971

S.O. 15—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Cast Iron Manhole Covers and Frames (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1971 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Cast Iron Manhole Covers and Frames (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Export of Cast Iron Manhole Covers and Frames (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1971, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

“6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories.”

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 2155, dated 28-5-1971.

का० आ० 16 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (स्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, बने हुए लोहे से बने नालों का निर्यात (स्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1977 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम बने हुए लोहे से बने नालों का निर्यात (स्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. बने हुए लोहे से बने नालों का निर्यात (स्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1977 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“7. निरीक्षण फीस—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान स्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (ii) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 1270, तारीख 30-4-1977

S.O. 15.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Cast Iron Spun Pipes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1977, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Cast Iron Spun Pipes (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Export of Cast Iron Spun Pipes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1977, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 1270, dated 30-4-1977.

का० आ० 17 —केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) विनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, डीजल इंजनों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम डीजल इंजनों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।
- (2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।
2. डीजल इंजनों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—
- (7) निरीक्षण फीस—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अतिक्रमण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :
 - (i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।
 - (ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।
 - (ii) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की सम्बन्धित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकाई के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर से होगी।

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 3207, तारीख 7-10-1967

[स० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

S.O. 17.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Diesel Engines (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Diesel Engines (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Export of Diesel Engines (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 3207, dated 7-10-1967.

का० आ० 18 —केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) विनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, घरेलू प्रशीतक का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम घरेलू प्रशीतक का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।
- (2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।
2. घरेलू प्रशीतक का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—
- (6) निरीक्षण फीस—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अतिक्रमण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :—
 - (i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।
 - (ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।
 - (ii) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबन्धित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकाई के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर से होगी।

[स० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी —का० आ० 2351, तारीख 14-9-1974

S.O. 18 In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Domestic Refrigerators (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1974 namely :—

1 (1) These rules may be called the Export of Domestic Refrigerators (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2 In the Export of Domestic Refrigerators (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1974, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

“6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories”.

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 2351 dated 14-9-1974.

का० आ० 19 —केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, शुष्क बैटरियों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम शुष्क बैटरियों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2 शुष्क बैटरियों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 5 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्—

“(5) निरीक्षण फीस —निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए पात पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के प्रदान रहने हुए पात पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।”

(ii) उन विनिर्दिष्ट निर्यातकर्तारों के लिए जो राज्य/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की मन्त्रिपरिषद् सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकाका के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर से होंगी।”

[स० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा ० नि० ३०]

निर्यात —का० आ० 1107, तारीख ३-६-1979

S.O. 19—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Dry Batteries (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1978 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Dry Batteries (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Dry Batteries (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 5, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

“5. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories”.

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 1607 dated 3-6-1978.

का० आ० 20 —केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, विद्युत् बैटरी और कंडक्टर का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1968 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्—

1 (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम विद्युत् बैटरी और कंडक्टर का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2 विद्युत् बैटरी और कंडक्टर का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1968 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्—

“(7) निरीक्षण फीस —निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण का निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी —

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए पात पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए पात पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(ii) उन विनिर्दिष्ट निर्यातकर्तारों के लिए जो राज्य/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की मन्त्रिपरिषद् सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकाका के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।”

[स० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा ० नि० ३०]

निर्यात —का० आ० 3193 तारीख 27-9-1988

S.O. 20.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Electric Cables and Conductor (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1968 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Electric Cables and Conductors (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Export of Electric Cables and Conductor (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1968, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 3493, dated 27-9-1968.

का०आ० 21.—केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, बिजली के तैप तथा ट्यूबों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् —

- 1 (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम बिजली के तैप तथा ट्यूबों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन, नियम, 1980 है।
- (2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।
2. बिजली के तैप तथा ट्यूबों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस - निर्यात कर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण का निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की सम्बन्धित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।"

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि०नि० तथा नि० 30]

दि०पू० : का०आ० 1609 तारीख 3-6-1978

S.O. 21.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Electric Lamps and Tubes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978 namely :—

- 1 (1) These rules may be called the Export of Electric Lamps and Tubes (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Export of Electric Lamps and Tubes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, in following rules shall be substituted namely :

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 1609 dated 3-6-1978.

का०आ० 22—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, बिजली के लैंपों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् —

- 1 (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम बिजली के लैंपों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।
- (2) ये राजपत्र की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।
- 2 बिजली के लैंपों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस— निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण का निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की सम्बन्धित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।"

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि०नि० तथा नि० 30]

दि०पू० : का०आ० 3215 तारीख 7-9-1967

S.O. 22.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Electric Fans (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1967 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Electric Fans (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Electric Fans (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-El&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 3215 dated 7-9-1967.

का० आ० 23 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, तामचीनी के बर्तनों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम तामचीनी के बर्तनों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।
- (2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।
2. तामचीनी के बर्तनों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा अर्थात् :—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस :—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेष्ठानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकाई के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।"

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी : का० आ० 2910 तारीख 30-8-1978

S.O. 23.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Enamel Wares (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1978 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Enamel Wares (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Enamel Wares (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978 for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (2) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80 El&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 2910 dated 30th August, 1978

का० आ० 24 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, विस्तारित धातुओं की इस्पात की चद्दरों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1980 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम विस्तारित धातुओं की इस्पात की चद्दरों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।
- (2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।
2. विस्तारित धातुओं की इस्पात की चद्दरों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा अर्थात् :—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस :—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेष्ठानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकाई के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।"

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी - का० आ० 4575 तारीख 19-12-1967

S.O. 24.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Expanded Metal Steel Sheets (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1967, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Expanded Metal Steel Sheets (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Expanded Metal Steel Sheets (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote:—S.O. 4575, dated 19-12-1967.

का० आ० 25.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, कालकों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम* 1973 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम कालकों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. कालकों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"6 निरीक्षण फीस :—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पीत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पीत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्दिष्ट निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।"

[गो० 6(9)/80-नि० तथा नि० 30]

*टिप्पणी :—का० आ० 1511, तारीख 27-5-1978।

S.O. 25.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Fasteners (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1978, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Fasteners (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Fasteners (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

"6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote:—S.O. 1511, dated 27-5-1978.

का० आ० 26.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, क्षणदीपों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम* 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम क्षणदीपों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. क्षणदीपों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस :—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पीत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पीत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्दिष्ट निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।"

[गो० 6(9)/80-नि० तथा नि० 30]

*टिप्पणी :—का० आ० 2139, तारीख 22-7-1978।

S.O. 26.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Flash Lights (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1978, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Flash Lights (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Flash Lights (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/ Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 2139, dated 22-7-1978.

S.O. 27.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Industrial Chains (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1978 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Industrial Chains (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Industrial Chains (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/ Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 1659, dated 10-6-1978.

का० आ० 27.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, औद्योगिक जंजीरों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम* 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम औद्योगिक जंजीरों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. औद्योगिक जंजीरों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस :—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेपण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेपणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेपण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की सम्बन्धित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकाका के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेपण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP नि० तथा नि० 23]

*टिप्पणी :—का०आ० 1659, तारीख 10-6-1978।

का० आ० 28.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, लघु अभियांत्रिक उत्पाद का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम* 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम लघु अभियांत्रिक उत्पाद का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. लघु अभियांत्रिक उत्पाद का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 8 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"6. निरीक्षण फीस :—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेपण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेपणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेपण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की सम्बन्धित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकाका के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेपण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 30 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।"

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP नि० तथा नि० 23]

*टिप्पणी :—का०आ० 894, तारीख 21-2-1976।

S.O. 28.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Light Engineering Products (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1976, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Light Engineering Products (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Light Engineering Products (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1976, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely:

"6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under:

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-FI&EP]

*Footnote :- S.O. 894, dated 21-2-1976.

का० आ० 29.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, पाइप फिटिंग्स का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम* 1977 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम पाइप फिटिंग्स का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. पाइप फिटिंग्स का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1977, के नियम 6, के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा अर्थात्—:

"6. निरीक्षण फीस:—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण की निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी:

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीम रुपय) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीम रुपय) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीम रुपय) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर से होगी।"

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० ति० तथा नि० उ०]

*टिप्पणी :- का० आ० 62, तारीख 1-1-1977।

S.O. 29.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Pipe Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1977, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Pipe Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Pipe Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1977, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely:

"Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under:

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme as the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-FI&EP]

*Footnote :- S.O. 62, dated 1-1-1977.

का० आ० 30.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, शक्ति चालित पम्प का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम*, 1967 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम शक्ति चालित पम्प का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. शक्ति चालित पम्प का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम* 1967, के नियम 7, के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्—

"(7) निरीक्षण फीस:—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण की निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी:

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीम रु०) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।
- (ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीम रुपय) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीम रुपय) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० ति० तथा नि० उ०]

*टिप्पणी :- का० आ० 3221, तारीख 8-9-1967।

S.O. 30.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Power Driven Pumps (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules^{*} 1967 namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Power Driven Pumps (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Power Driven Pumps (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely:

“7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under:

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories.”

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote:—S.O. 3221, dated 8-9-1967.

का० आ० 31.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, शक्ति परिणामित का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1977 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम शक्ति परिणामित का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. शक्ति परिणामित का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1977 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“(7) निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण के निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी:—

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर से होगी”।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी:—का० आ० 2276, तारीख 9-7-1977

S.O. 31.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Power Transformer (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules^{*} 1977 namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Power Transformer (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Power Transformer (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1977, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely:

“7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under:

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of State/Union Territories”.

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote:—S.O. 2276, dated 9-7-1977.

का० आ० 32.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, कक्ष वास्तानुकूलक का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 संशोधन का करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम कक्ष वास्तानुकूलक का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे:

2. कक्ष वास्तानुकूलक का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“(6) निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी:—

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर से होगी”।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी:—का० आ० 2355, तारीख 14-9-1974

S.O. 32.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Room Air Conditioners (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1974 namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Room Air Conditioners (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Room Air Conditioners (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1974, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely:

"6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under:

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of State/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote:—S.O. 2355, dated 14-9-1974.

का० खा० 33.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सफाई तथा जल फिटिंग्स का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम सफाई तथा जल फिटिंग्स का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. सफाई तथा जल फिटिंग्स का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

"6. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अधिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी:

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० खा० 1509, तारीख 27-5-1978

S.O. 33.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Sanitary Water Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1978, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Sanitary Water Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Sanitary Water Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely:

"6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under:

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per cent per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote:—S.O. 1509, dated 27-5-1978.

का० खा० 34.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सफाई मशीन का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम सफाई मशीन का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. सफाई मशीन का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अधिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी:

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० खा० 3211, तारीख 7-9-1967

S.O. 34.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Sewing Machines (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1967 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Sewing Machines (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Sewing Machines (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 3211, dated 7-9-1967.

का० भा० 35.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, चांदी के पत्तर चढ़े बर्तनों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम चांदी के पत्तर चढ़े बर्तनों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. चांदी के पत्तर चढ़े बर्तनों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।"

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० भा० 719, तारीख 11-3-1978

S.O. 35.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Silver Plated Wares (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1978 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Silver Plated Wares (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Silver Plated Wares (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted, namely

"6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as small scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 719, dated 11-3-1978.

का० भा० 36.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, छोटे औजार और हाथ के औजार का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम छोटे औजार और हाथ के औजार का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. छोटे औजार और हाथ के औजार का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।"

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० भा० 3412, तारीख 20-9-1967

S.O. 36.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Small Tools and Hand Tools (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1967, namely :

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Small Tools and Hand Tools (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Small Tools and Hand Tools (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 3412, dated 20-9-1967.

का० आ० 37.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, स्टेनलेस स्टील के बर्तन का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम स्टेनलेस स्टील के बर्तन का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. स्टेनलेस स्टील के बर्तन का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि०नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पण—का० आ० 372, तारीख 27-1-1968

S.O. 37.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Stainless Steel Utensils (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1967 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Stainless Steel Utensils (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Stainless Steel Utensils (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 372, dated 27-1-1968.

का० आ० 38.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, स्टील ट्यूब का निर्यात क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1970 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम स्टील ट्यूब का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. स्टील ट्यूब का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1970 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"6. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (ii) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 2743 तारीख 13-8-1970

S.O. 38.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Steel Tubes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1970 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Steel Tubes (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Steel Tubes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1970, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

“6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories”.

{F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP}

*Footnote :—S.O. 2743, dated 13-8-1970.

का० आ० 39.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, स्टील के टंक का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम स्टील के टंक का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है ।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे ।

2. स्टील के टंक का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्

“6. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेष्ण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से ।
- (ख) परेष्णानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेष्ण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से ।
- (ii) उन विनिर्माताओं निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेष्ण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी ।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 4455 तारीख 14-12-1967

S.O. 39.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Steel Trunks (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Steel Trunks (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Steel Trunks (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

“6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories”.

{F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP}

*Footnote :—S.O. 4455, dated 14-12-1967.

का० आ० 40.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इस्पात के तार के रस्से का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1980 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम इस्पात के तार के रस्से का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है ।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे ।

2. इस्पात के तार के रस्से का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“7. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेष्ण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से ।
- (ख) परेष्णानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेष्ण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से ।
- (ii) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेष्ण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी ।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 1990 तारीख 10-8-1974

S.O. 40.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Steel Wire Ropes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1974 namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Steel Wire Rope (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Steel Wire Ropes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1974, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely:

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under:

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/ Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote:—S.O. 1990, dated 10-8-1974.

का० भा० 41.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, संचायक बैटरी का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

6. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम संचायक बैटरी का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. संचायक बैटरी का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी:

- (i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेयण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेयणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेयण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेयण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० भा० 1507 तारीख 27-5-1978

S.O. 41.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Storage Batteries (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1978 namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Storage Batteries (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Storage Batteries (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely:

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under:

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/ Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote:—S.O. 1507, dated 27-5-1978.

का० भा० 42.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, पारेषण साइन टावर का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1971 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम पारेषण साइन टावर का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. पारेषण साइन टावर का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1971 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा अर्थात्:—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी:

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेयण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेयणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेयण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (ii) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेयण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० भा० 5577 तारीख 25-12-1971

S.O. 42.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Transmission Line Towers (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1971 namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Transmission Line Towers (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Transmission Line Towers (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1971, for rule 7, the following rule shall be substituted namely :

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 5577, dated 25-12-1971.

का०प्रा० 43.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, वाल्वों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम*, 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम वाल्वों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. वाल्वों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 9 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"9. निरीक्षण फीस : निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्र० तथा 0.36 प्र० की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि०नि० तथा नि०उ०]

*टिप्पणी :—का०प्रा० 3094 तारीख 29-10-1978

S.O. 43.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Valves (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1978 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Valves (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Valves (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 9, the following rule shall be substituted namely :

"9. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 3094, dated 29-10-1978.

का०प्रा० 44 —केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, जल प्रशीतकों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम*, 1974 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम जल प्रशीतकों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. जल प्रशीतकों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"6 निरीक्षण फीस : निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्र० की दर से।

(ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्र० की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्र० तथा 0.36 प्र० की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि०नि० तथा नि०उ०]

*टिप्पणी :—का०प्रा० 2353 तारीख 14-9-74

S.O. 44.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Water Coolers (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1974 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Water Coolers (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2 In the Export of Water Coolers (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1974, for rule 6, the following rule shall be substituted namely

"6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs 20 per consignment
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs 20 per consignment
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories"

[F No 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote —S.O 2353 dated 14-9-1974

कां० 45 —केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, बैल्डिंग इलेक्ट्रोड का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम* 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् —

1 (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम बैल्डिंग इलेक्ट्रोड का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2 बैल्डिंग इलेक्ट्रोड का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् —

"7 निरीक्षण फीस —निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अधिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्र० की दर से।

(ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/सब राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकको के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्र० तथा 0.36 प्र० की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि०नि० तथा नि०उ०]

*टिप्पणी —कां० 1611 तारीख 3-6-1978।

S.O. 45.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Welding Electrodes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1978 namely —

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Welding Electrodes (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette

2. In the Export of Welding Electrodes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, the following rule shall be substituted namely :

"7 Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs 20 per consignment
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote.—S.O 1611 dated 3-6-1978.

कां० 46— केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इस्पात के तार की लड़ियों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम*, 1979 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् —

1 (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम इस्पात के तार की लड़ियों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2 इस्पात के तार लड़ियों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1979 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् —

"7 निरीक्षण फीस —निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अधिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्र० की दर से।

(ख) परेक्षणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्र० की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/सब राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकको के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं, प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपये) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्र० तथा 0.36 प्र० की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि०नि० तथा नि०उ०]

*टिप्पणी —कां० 2125 तारीख 23-6-1979।

S.O. 46.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Steel Wire Strands (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules* 1979 namely :—

1 (1) These rules may be called the Export of Steel Wire Strands (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Steel Wire Strands (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, the following rule shall be substituted namely :

"7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

*Footnote :—S.O. 2125, dated 23-6-1979.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 3 जनवरी, 1981

का० प्रा० 47.—निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह राय है कि भारत के निर्यात व्यापार के विकास के लिए ऐसा करना आवश्यक और समीचीन है कि सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का निर्यात से पूर्व निरीक्षण किया जाए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त प्रयोजन के लिए नीचे विनिर्दिष्ट प्रस्ताव बनाए हैं और उन्हें निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 11 के उप-नियम (2) की अपेक्षानुसार निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद् को भेज दिया है ;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त उपनियम के अनुसरण में उक्त प्रस्तावों को उन लोगों की जानकारी के लिए प्रकाशित करती है, जिनके उनसे प्रभावित होने की संभावना है ।

2. सूचना दी जाती है कि यदि कोई व्यक्ति उक्त प्रस्तावों के बारे में कोई आक्षेप या सुझाव भेजना चाहता है तो वह उसे (इस आदेश के राजपत्र) में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से पैंतालीस दिन के भीतर निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद्, 'वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर' 14/1-बी, एचरा स्ट्रीट (भाठवीं मंजिल) कलकत्ता-700001 को भेज सकता है ।

प्रस्ताव

(i) यह अधिसूचित करना कि सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का निर्यात से पूर्व निरीक्षण किया जाएगा ;

(ii) (क) सुसंगत भारतीय या अन्य राष्ट्रीय मानकों को, या

(ख) निर्यात-कर्ता द्वारा विदेशी नेता और निर्यात-कर्ता के मध्य निर्यात संधि के स्वीकृत विनिर्देशों के रूप में घोषित विनिर्देशों का परन्तु यह तब जब कि वे उपरोक्त (क) में दिए गए मानकों से नीचे के न होंगे,

सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों के लिए मानक विनिर्देशों के रूप में स्वीकृत देना ।

(iii) इस आदेश के उपाबंध-1 में उप-बर्णित, सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1980 के प्रावधान के अनुसार निरीक्षण के प्रकार को निरीक्षण के ऐसे प्रकार के रूप में विनिर्दिष्ट करना जो ऐसी सीमेंट कंकरीट के फर्श की टाइलों को लागू होगा,

(iv) अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार के दौरान ऐसी सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों के निर्यात को तब तक प्रतिषिद्ध करना जब तक कि उसके साथ निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 के अधीन स्थापित निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरणों में से किसी एक अभिकरण द्वारा जारी किया गया इस भाषण का प्रमाण पत्र न हो कि सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों पूर्वोक्त मानक विनिर्देशों के अनुरूप हैं ।

3 इस आदेश की कोई भी बात भावी क्रेताओं को भूमि, समुद्र या वायु मार्ग द्वारा सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों के वास्तविक नमूनों के निर्यात को लागू नहीं होगी परन्तु यह तब जब कि परेयण का पोत पर्यन्त मूल्य दो सौ पचास रुपए से अधिक हो ।

4. इस आदेश में "सीमेंट कंकरीट के फर्श की टाइलों" से वे टाइलें अभिप्रेत हैं जो साधारण पोर्टलैंड या क्षिप्रकठोरन पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट प्राकृतिक योग तथा रंगीन सामग्री के मिश्रण से विनिर्मित बाब प्रक्रिया द्वारा, जहाँ अपेक्षित हो, विनिर्मित हैं तथा इनके अन्तर्गत साधारण सीमेंट, साधारण रंग तथा टैराजों प्रकार की टाइलें भी हैं । टाइलों के प्रकार के लिए निम्नलिखित परिभाषा लागू होगी :—

(क) साधारण सीमेंट की टाइलें—वे टाइलें हैं जिनके विनिर्माण में बर्णकों का प्रयोग नहीं किया जाता ।

(ख) साधारण रंग की टाइलें—वे टाइलें हैं जिनकी सपाट घिसने वाली सतह होती है जिनमें बर्णक (क) का प्रयोग किया जाता है किन्तु वे स्टोव चिप्स रहित होते हैं ।

(ग) टैराजों टाइलें—वे टाइलें हैं जिनकी घिसने वाली सतह बर्णक सहित या रहित मिश्रित पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट के मैट्रिक्स में स्टोन चिप्स से बनी है ।

उपाबंध-1

निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 के अधीन बनाए जाने वाले प्रस्तावित नियमों का प्रारूप ।

1. संक्षिप्त नाम :—इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1980 है ।

2. परिभाषाएं :—इन नियमों में जब तक कि संदर्भ से अन्यथा अपेक्षित न हो,—

(क) "अधिनियम" से निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) अभिप्रेत है,

(ख) "अभिकरण" से अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन स्थापित निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरणों में से कोई एक अभिकरण अभिप्रेत है,

(ग) "परिषद्" से अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अधीन स्थापित निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद् अभिप्रेत है,

(घ) "सीमेंट कंकरीट के फर्श की टाइलों" से वे टाइलें अभिप्रेत हैं जो साधारण पोर्टलैंड या क्षिप्र कठोरन पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट प्राकृतिक योग तथा रंगीन सामग्री के मिश्रण से बाब प्रक्रिया द्वारा—, जहाँ अपेक्षित हो, विनिर्मित हैं तथा इनके अन्तर्गत साधारण सीमेंट, साधारण रंग तथा टैराजों प्रकार की टाइलें भी हैं । टाइलों के प्रकार के लिए निम्नलिखित परिभाषाएं लागू होंगी :—

(i) साधारण सीमेंट की टाइलें हैं वे टाइलें जिनके विनिर्माण में बर्णकों का प्रयोग नहीं होता ।

- (ii) साधारण रंगीन टाइल—वे टाइलें जिनकी सपाट चिंगन वाली सतह होती है, किन्तु वे स्टोन चिप्स रहित हूँ। जिनमें वर्णों का प्रयोग किया जाता है,
- (iii) टेराजो टाइलें—वे टाइलें हैं जिनकी चिंगन वाली सतह वर्णों सहित या रहित मिश्रित पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट के मैट्रिक्स में स्टोन चिप्स में बनी है।

(क) 'अनुसूची' में इन नियमों में सफल अनुसूची अभिप्रेत है,

3. निरीक्षण का आधार.—निर्यात के लिए आशयित सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का निरीक्षण यह सुनिश्चित करने से किया जाएगा कि उनकी बनाविटी अधिनियम की धारा 6 के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा मान्यताप्राप्त विनिर्देशों के अनुरूप है, अर्थात्—

- (क) सुसंगत भारतीय या अन्य कोई राष्ट्रीय मानकों, या
- (ख) निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा विदेशी क्रेता और निर्यातकर्ता के मध्य निर्यात सन्धि के स्वीकृत विनिर्देशों के रूप में घोषित विनिर्देशों परन्तु यह तब जबकि वे उपरोक्त (क) में दिए गए मानकों में नीचे के न हों, या
- (ग) अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट, परीक्षण पद्धति तथा नमूना लेने के माप मानकों को अपना कर तैयार उत्पाद के निरीक्षण तथा परीक्षण के आधार पर।

4. निरीक्षण की प्रक्रिया :—(1) सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का निर्यात करने का इच्छुक निर्यातकर्ता अपने ऐसा करने के आग्रह की सूचना लिखित रूप में संबंधित निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण को देगा तथा ऐसी सूचना के साथ निर्यात संविदा या आदेश की एक प्रति अधिकरण के निकटतम कार्यालय को दे ताकि वह नियम 3 के अनुसार निरीक्षण कर सके।

(2) उपनियम (1) के अधीन प्रत्येक सूचना पदान की आशयित तारीख से कम से कम सात दिन पहले दी जाएगी।

(3) उपनियम (2) के अधीन सूचना प्राप्त होने पर अधिकरण नियम 3 तथा परिषद् द्वारा समय-समय पर जारी किए गए निर्देशों के अनुसार निरीक्षण करेगा।

(4) यदि निरीक्षण के पश्चात् अधिकरण का यह समाधान हो जाता है कि सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का निर्यात किए जाने वाला परेषण नियम 3 की अपेक्षाओं के अनुरूप है तो वह उपनियम (2) के अधीन सूचना प्राप्त होने के सात दिनों के भीतर यह घोषणा करने हुए कि परेषण निर्यात योग्य है, निर्यातकर्ता को प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करेगा :

परन्तु जहां अधिकरण का इस प्रकार समाधान नहीं होता है वहां वह सात दिन की उक्त अवधि के भीतर ऐसे प्रमाण पत्र जारी करने से इंकार कर देगा तथा ऐसे इंकार की सूचना उसके कारणों सहित निर्यातकर्ता को देगा।

5. निरीक्षण का स्थान.—इन नियमों के अधीन प्रत्येक निरीक्षण या तो विनिर्माता के परिसर पर किया जाएगा या उस परिसर पर किया जाएगा जहां निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा मानक पेश किया जाता है परन्तु यह तब जब कि वहां इस प्रयोजन के लिए पर्याप्त सुविधाएं विद्यमान हों।

6. निरीक्षण फीस.—प्रत्येक परेषण के लिए न्यूनतम 100 रुपए के अधीन रहते हुए, ऐसे प्रत्येक परेषण के लिए पोत पर्याप्त निष्पक्ष मूल्य के प्रत्येक एक सौ रुपए के लिए 50 पैसे की दर से निरीक्षण फीस के रूप में दी जाएगी।

7. अपील—(i) नियम 4 के उपनियम (4) के अधीन निरीक्षण अधिकरण द्वारा प्रभाव-पत्र जारी करने से इंकार किए जाने से व्यथित कोई व्यक्ति ऐसे इंकार की सूचना प्राप्त होने के दस दिनों के भीतर इस प्रयोजन के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त तीन अन्योन्य किन्तु अधिकतम

सात में अधिकतम व्यक्तियों में गठित विशेषज्ञों के पैनल को अपील कर सकता है।

(ii) विशेषज्ञों के पैनल की कुल सदस्यता के कम से कम दो तिहाई सदस्य गैर सरकारी सदस्य होंगे।

(iii) पैनल की गणपूर्ति तीन से होगी।

(iv) अपील प्राप्त होने के पञ्च दिन के भीतर निष्ठा दी जाएगी।

अनुसूची

1. नमूना लेने का मापमान :—नमूना लेने के मापमान के संबंध में संविधानिक विनिर्देशों में विनिर्दिष्ट अनुबंधों के अभाव में नीचे अधिकृत अनुबंध लागू होगा—

अपेक्षित परीक्षणों को करने के लिए अपेक्षित टाइलों का चयन यावृत्तक प्रतिचयन मापमान द्वारा किया जाएगा। 110,000 टाइलों के या भाग के प्रत्येक परेषण में से चयन की जाने वाली टाइलों की संख्या निम्नलिखित होगी—

(क) आकार तथा बिभाज्य, घिसने वाली परत तथा साधारण बनाविटी पर अपेक्षाओं की अनुरूपता के लिए—12 टाइलें।

(ख) अनुप्रस्थ क्षमता परीक्षण के लिए—

(i) शुष्क परीक्षण के लिए—“ 6 टाइलें

(ii) आद्र परीक्षण के लिए : “ 6 टाइलें

उक्त (क) के लिए चयन की गई टाइलें, अपेक्षाओं के सत्यापन के पश्चात्

उक्त (ख) के लिए भी प्रयोग की जा सकती हैं।

(ग) शिवाई परीक्षण की रंगता के लिए—“ 6 टाइलें

(घ) जल अवशोषक परीक्षण के लिए—“ 6 टाइलें

2. अनुरूपता के मापदंड—यदि निर्यात सन्धि में अन्यथा विनिर्दिष्ट नहीं किया जाता है तो किए गए परीक्षणों की अनुरूपता के मापदंड समय-समय पर संशोधित सुसंगत भारतीय मानक विनिर्देश, अर्थात् भा० मा० 1237-1959 के अनुसार होंगे और उनका अनुसरण किया जाएगा।

3. परीक्षण की पद्धतियाँ—यदि निर्यात सन्धि में विनिर्दिष्ट नहीं है तो उस परीक्षण पद्धति का अनुसरण किया जाएगा जो समय-समय पर संशोधित सुसंगत भारतीय मानक विनिर्देश, विनिर्देश, अर्थात् भा० मा० 1237-1959 में विनिर्दिष्ट है।

[सं० 6(15)/80-नि०नि० तथा नि० उ०]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 3rd January, 1981

S.O. 47.—Whereas, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the Export (Quality Control & Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary or expedient so to do for the development of the export trade of India that cement concrete flooring tiles should be subject to inspection prior to export;

And whereas the Central Government has formulated the proposals specified below for the said purpose and has forwarded the same to the Export Inspection Council, as required by sub-rule (2) of rule 11 of the Export (Quality Control & Inspection) Rules, 1964.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the said sub-rule the Central Government hereby publishes the said proposals for the information of the public likely to be affected thereby.

2. Notice is hereby given that any person desiring to forward any objections or suggestions with respect to the said proposals may forward the same within forty five days of the date of publication of this Order in the Official Gazette to the Export Inspection Council, 'World Trade Centre', 14/1B Ezra Street, (7th floor), Calcutta-700 001.

PROPOSALS

(i) To notify that cement concrete flooring tiles shall be subject to inspection prior to export,

(ii) To Recognise—

(a) Relevant Indian or any other National Standards; or

(b) the specifications declared by the exporter to be the agreed specifications of the export contract between the foreign buyer and the exporter, provided the same are not below the standard as in (a) above;

as the standard specifications for cement concrete flooring tiles;

(iii) To specify the type of inspection in accordance with the draft Export of Cement Concrete Flooring Tiles (Inspection) Rules, 1980 set out in Annexure I to this Order, as the type of inspection which would be applied to such cement concrete flooring tiles;

(iv) To prohibit the export in the course of International Trade of such cement concrete flooring tiles, unless the same is accompanied by a certificate, issued by any of the Export Inspection Agencies, established under section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) to the effect, that the cement concrete flooring tiles conform to the aforesaid standard specifications.

3. Nothing in this Order shall apply to the export by land, sea or air of bonafide samples of cement concrete flooring tiles to the prospective buyers provided the F. O. B. value of the consignment does not exceed rupees two hundred and fifty.

4. In this Order "cement concrete flooring tiles" shall mean tiles manufactured from a mixture of ordinary portland or rapid hardening portland cement, natural aggregates and colouring material where required, by pressure and covers tiles of plain cement, plain coloured and terrazo types. The following definitions shall apply for the types of tiles—

(a) Plain Cement Tiles—Tiles in the manufacture of which no pigments are used.

(b) Plain coloured Tiles—Tiles having a plain wearing surface wherein pigments are used but without stone chips.

(c) Terrazo Tiles—Tiles whose wearing surface is composed of stone chip in matrix of portland cement mixed with or without pigments.

ANNEXURE-I

[Draft rules proposed to be made under section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963)]

1. Short title :—These rules may be called the Export of Cement Concrete Flooring Tiles (Inspection) Rules, 1980.

2. Definitions :—In these rules unless the context otherwise requires—

(a) "Act" means the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963);

(b) "Agency" means any one of the Export Inspection Agencies established under section 7 of the Act;

(c) "Council" means Export Inspection Council established under section 3 of the Act;

(d) "Cement concrete flooring tiles" means tiles manufactured from a mixture of ordinary portland or rapid hardening portland cement, natural aggregates and colouring material where required, by pressure process and covers tiles of plain cement, plain coloured and terrazo types. The following definitions shall apply for the types of tiles :—

(i) Plain cement tiles—Tiles in the manufacture of which no pigments are used

(ii) Plain coloured tiles—Tiles having a plain surface wherein pigments are used, but without stone chips,

(iii) Terrazo tiles—Tiles whose wearing surface is composed of stone chips in matrix of portland cement mixed with or without pigments.

(c) "Schedule" means the Schedule appended to these rules;

3. Basis of inspection :—Inspection of cement concrete flooring tiles shall be carried out with a view to ensuring that the quality of the same conforms to the specifications recognised by the Central Government under section 6 of the Act, namely, (a) relevant Indian or any other National Standards ; or (b) the specifications declared by the exporter to export cement concrete flooring tiles shall give intimation the foreign buyer and the exporter, provided the same are not below the standard as in (a) above,

(c) On the basis of inspection and testing of finished products by adopting the scale of sampling and method of test specified in the Schedule.

4. Procedure of inspection :—(1) The exporter intending to export cement concrete flooring tiles shall give intimation in writing of his intention so to do, to the concerned Export Inspection Agency and submit along with such intimation a copy of the export contract or order to the nearest office of the Agency to enable it to carry out the inspection in accordance with rule 3.

(2) Every intimation under sub-rule (1) shall be given not less than seven days before the expected date of shipment.

(3) On receipt of the intimation under sub rule (2) the Agency shall carry out the inspection in accordance with rule 3 and instruction issued by the Council from time to time.

(4) If, after the inspection, the agency is satisfied that the consignment of cement concrete flooring tiles to be exported complies with the requirement of rule 3;

It shall within seven days of the receipt of the intimation under sub-rule (2) issue a certificate to the exporter declaring the consignment as export-worthy :

Provided that where the Agency is not so satisfied, it shall within the said period of seven days refuse to issue such certificate and communicate such refusal to the exporter along with the reasons therefor.

5. Place of inspection :—Every inspection under these rules shall be carried out either at the premises of the manufacturer or at the premises at which the goods are offered by the exporter, provided adequate facilities for the purpose exist therein.

6. Inspection Fee :—Subject to minimum of Rs. 100/- for each consignment, a fee at the rate of 50 paise for every one hundred rupees of the F. O. B. value for each such consignment shall be paid as inspection fee.

7. Appeal.—(i) Any person aggrieved by the refusal of the inspection agency to issue a certificate under sub-rule (4) of rule 4, may, within ten days of receipt of the communication of such refusal by him, prefer an appeal to a panel of experts consisting of not less three but not more than seven persons as may be appointed for the purpose by the Central Government.

(ii) At least two thirds of the total membership of the panel of experts shall consist of non-officials.

(iii) The quorum for the panel shall be three.

(iv) The appeal shall be disposed of within fifteen days of its receipt.

SCHEDULE

1. Scale of sampling:—In absence of specific stipulation in the contractual specifications as regards sampling scale, the same as laid down below shall become applicable.

The tiles required for carrying out the required tests shall be selected by 'random sampling'. The number of tiles to be selected from each consignment of 10,000 tiles or part thereof shall be as follows :—

(a) For conformity to requirements on shape and dimensions, wearing layer, and general quality—12 tiles.

(b) For transverse strength test :

- (i) For dry test 6 tiles
(ii) For wet test 6 tiles

The tiles selected for (a) may as well, after verification of requirements, be used for (b).

- (c) For resistance to wear test 6 tiles
(d) For water absorption test 6 tiles

2. Criteria of conformity—If not otherwise specified in the export contract, the criteria of conformity of the tests carried out shall be as per relevant Indian Standard specification, namely IS 1237-1959 as amended from time to time or shall be followed.

3. Methods of test—If not specified in the export contract, test methods as specified in the relevant Indian Standards specification, namely, IS 1237-1959 as amended from time to time shall be followed.

[No. 6 (15)/80-EI & EP]

का० आ० 48.— भारत के निर्यात व्यापार के विकास के लिए पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का निर्यात से पूर्व क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण किए जाने के लिए कनिष्ठ प्रस्ताव निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 11 के उप-नियम (2) की अपेक्षानुसार भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय के आदेश सं० का० आ० 3541 तारीख 10 अक्टूबर 1979, के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3, उप-खंड (2) तारीख 20 अक्टूबर 1979 में प्रकाशित किए गए थे ;

और राजपत्र में उक्त आदेश के प्रकाशन से 45 दिन के भीतर उनसे प्रभावित होने वाले सभी व्यक्तियों से आक्षेप तथा मुद्दाव मांगे गए थे ;

और उक्त राजपत्र की प्रतियां जनता को 29 अक्टूबर 1979 को उपलब्ध करा दी गयी थी ;

उक्त आक्षेप प्रस्तावों पर जनता से प्राप्त आक्षेपों और मुद्दावों पर केन्द्रीय सरकार ने विचार कर लिया है ;

अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद् से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् यह गम्य होने पर कि भारत व्यापार के विकास के लिए ऐसा करना आवश्यक तथा समीचीन है, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, तथा भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 2376 तारीख 6 अगस्त, 1966 को अधिष्ठात करने हुए :—

- (1) अधिसूचित करती है कि पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का निर्यात से पूर्व निरीक्षण किया जाएगा।
- (2) पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1980 के अनुसार निरीक्षण के प्रकार को निरीक्षण के उस प्रकार के रूप से विनिर्दिष्ट करती है, जो ऐसे पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े को उनके निर्यात से पूर्व लागू होगा।
- (3) (क) निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद् द्वारा मान्यताप्राप्त राष्ट्रीय और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मानकों तथा अन्य सस्थाओं के मानकों को,
(ख) इस आदेश के उपाबंध में विनिर्दिष्ट न्यूनतम विशेषताओं का समाधान करने वाले उत्पाद के सविदाकारी विनिर्देशों को,
(ग) निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा घोषित ऐसे विनिर्देशों को, जो निर्यातकर्ता तथा विदेशी नेता के बीच, ऐसी निर्यात संविदाओं के लिए, जिनकी राजपत्र में इस आदेश के प्रकाशन की तारीख से पूर्व पुष्टि की गयी है तथा उस तारीख से

छाठ दिन की अवधि के भीतर निर्यात कर दिया गया है, निर्यात संविदा के विनिर्देशों के रूप में करार पाए गए हैं, पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के लिए मानक विनिर्देशों के रूप में मान्यता देती है।

टिप्पणी.—जब निर्यात संविदा व्यौरेवार तकनीकी आवश्यकताओं को उपबोधित नहीं करती है या केवल नमूनों पर आधारित होती है, तब निर्यातकर्ता को लिखित रूप में विनिर्देश प्रस्तुत करने चाहिए।

- (4) अंतर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार के अनुक्रम में ऐसे पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के निर्यात का तब तक प्रतिषिद्ध करती है जब तक कि उसके साथ निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 के अधीन स्थापित किसी निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण द्वारा जारी किया गया इस आदेश का प्रमाण पत्र न हो कि ऐसा पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़ा निर्यात निरीक्षण नियम, 1980 के अनुसार निर्यात योग्य है या उस पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा मान्यताप्राप्त मुद्रा या चिन्ह लगा दिया गया है ;

(2) इस आदेश की कोई भी बात—

- (क) भू, वायु या समुद्र मार्ग द्वारा पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के भावो श्रेणाओं को निर्यात किए जाने वाले उन वास्तविक नमूनों को लागू नहीं होगी जिनका पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य 125/- रुपए से अधिक नहीं है।
- (ख) पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के ऐसे परेषण, जो राजपत्र में इस आदेश के प्रकाशन की तारीख के तुरंत पूर्व विनिर्माता या निर्यातकर्ता के परिसर से जा चुके हों।

- (3) इस आदेश में “पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े” से कपाम, पटमन, रेयन, नायलोन या अन्य किसी संश्लिष्ट फेब्रिक से बना वह कपड़ा अभिप्रेत है जिसके एक ओर या दोनों ओर उपर्युक्त संयोजित बाइनिल क्लोराइड बहुलक (पालिभर) या सहबहुलक का लेप किया गया है या परत चढ़ाई गई है।

- (4) यह आदेश राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होगा।

उपाबंध

पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के लिए न्यूनतम विनिर्देश

1. सामग्री तथा विनिर्माण (1) विलेपन (क) पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का विनिर्माण, मूल फेब्रिक पर एक या दोनों ओर उपर्युक्ततः संयोजित बाइनिल क्लोराइड बहुलक और सहबहुलक का एकसर लेप करके या परत चढ़ा कर किया जाएगा।
- (ख) विलेपन यौगिक का संयोजन तैयार माल को अपेक्षित रूप तथा दृढ़ता देने के लिए होगा।
- (ग) विलेपन न फूटने वाला और पिन छिद्रों तथा अन्य यांत्रिक दोषों से रहित होगा। वह विपश्चिपा नहीं होगा और उसमें कोई कुर्मन्ध नहीं होगा।

टिप्पणी : जिल्सराजी के प्रयोजन के लिए आशयित पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़ा श्रेणी ग के मामले में, पिन छिद्र यद्यपि दृष्टिगम्य हों परन्तु पानी प्रवेश नहीं अनुज्ञेय होगा।

2. मूल फेब्रिक—इस प्रयोजना के लिए प्रयुक्त मूल फेब्रिक अच्छी क्वालिटी तथा बनावट का और मजबूत होगा। यह साफ होगा और खुलाई तथा विनिर्माण संबंधी दोषों से युक्तियुक्ततः रहित होगा, जिससे कि परिष्कृत विलेपन के पश्चात कोई मुख्य दोष दिखाई न दें।

3 बाह्याकृति—सामग्री, निम्नलिखित के संबंध में, सर्वथा श्रेता के निश्चित निर्दिष्टों या अनुमोदित नमूनों के अनुरूप होगी

- (1) विलेपन या मूल फौजिक का रंग अवशः गेड,
- (2) विलेपन की डिजाइन, कण या प्रिंट;
- (3) समझी परिमृज्जा नाँचे वर्गीकृत किन्हीं मुख्य दोषों में रहित होगी, तथापि नीचे वर्गीकृत गौण दोषों को निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहने दिया जाएगा :—

(क) ये बहुत छोटे क्षेत्र में हों और इनमें साधारणतः उत्पाद के गुण धर्म या क्वालिटी कम न हों।

(ख) पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े की श्रेणी क और ख के लिए 40 मीटर या इससे अधिक के लिए प्रत्येक रोल में अधिकतम 10 गौण दोष अनुज्ञेय होंगे।

टिप्पणी :—श्रेणी ग के मामले में, पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े जब जिल्द-साजी के प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयुक्त किए जाते हैं, प्रत्येक मीटर में एक गौण दोष अनुज्ञेय होगा।

(ग) पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के मेजपोशों की दशा में, निरीक्षक एक दर्जन मेजपोशों में गौण दोष की अनुज्ञा दी जा सकती है।

मुख्य दोष का वर्गीकरण

- (1) खरोंच, कर्नन चिह्न तथा छिद्र।
- (2) नियमित अन्तरालों पर छपाई दोषों की पुनरावृत्ति।
- (3) अनेपिच पेच/लाइनें।
- (4) चैनल लाइनें तथा विराम चिह्न।
- (5) विलेपन सतह पर गेड में विभिन्नता।
- (6) दोषपूर्ण किनारा जिससे न्यूनतम चौड़ाई प्रभावित होती है।
- (7) क्षिपिणी सतह।
- (8) मध्य में या आसपास शिकनें, जो लम्बाई में 10 से० मी० से अधिक की है।
- (9) अरुण विलेपन।
- (10) असम उच्चित्रण, जो भौतिक बाह्याकृति पर प्रभाव डालता है।

गौण दोषों का वर्गीकरण—

- (1) तेल की बूँदों के चिह्न तथा धब्बे जिनका व्यास 10 मी० मी० तक है।
- (2) 10 से० मी० तक की लम्बाई वाली विलेपन लाइनें।
- (3) केवल श्रेणी क तथा ख पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के लिए फौजिक में बुनाई, गाँठें, धम्बे मारे तथा पुनिया डाले धागे जैसे उत्पन्न हुए दोषों में से गौण बुनाई दोष। जब यह जिह्द-साजी के प्रयोजन के लिए प्रयुक्त होगा तो श्रेणी 'ग' पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े में ये दोष नहीं माने जाएंगे।
- (4) 10 से० मी० से कम लम्बाई वाली शिकनें।
- (5) मानक चौड़ाई से बाहर के दोष।
- (6) बार्डर का निरों पर मुड़ा होना।
- (7) दोषपूर्ण किनारा जैसे काटा हुआ, विकृत, घुमावदार, छल्लेदार आदि जिससे न्यूनतम चौड़ाई प्रभावित नहीं होती है।
- (8) भौतिक बाह्याकृति को प्रभावित न करने वाला पिछली ओर का विलेपन।
- (9) असम असम उच्चित्रण, जो भौतिक बाह्याकृति को प्रभावित करता है।
- (10) हल्की उधावित छपाई, जो भौतिक बाह्याकृति को प्रभावित नहीं करती है।

(4) पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के रोलों या मेजपोशों की विमाण श्रेता द्वारा तथा चिन्तिषिष्ट होगी। तथापि संधिधामक निर्दिष्टों में, रोलों की चौड़ाई और मेजपोशों के आकार में 5 प्रतिशत तक की छूट की अनुज्ञा होगी।

2. पी० बी० सी० विलेपन का भार तथा चर्म कपड़े का कुल भार

(1) कुल भार :—पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े की तीन श्रेणियों का न्यूनतम कुल भार ग्राम/वर्गमीटर में निम्नलिखित होगा :—

श्रेणी	ग्राम वर्गमीटर में न्यूनतम कुल भार.
क	400
ख	300
ग	200

(2) पी० बी० सी० विलेपन—पी० बी० सी० विलेपन के घोषित भार पर +15 प्रतिशत तथा 5 प्रतिशत छूट की अनुज्ञा होगी।

3. विभंजन सामर्थ्य—पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े की तीन श्रेणियों की न्यूनतम विभंजन सामर्थ्य निम्नलिखित होगी :—

श्रेणी	न्यूनतम विभंजन में० मी० चौड़ाई में ताने की दशा में	सामर्थ्य कि० ग्रा० में 5 बाने की दशा में
क	30	25
ख	15	12
ग	12	10

टिप्पणी :—रेयान की पीठिका में निर्मित पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े की दशा में और श्रेणी 'क' की कांटांग के साथ जैसे न्यूनतम 400 ग्राम प्रति वर्ग मीटर, ताने की ओर न्यूनतम टूटन सामर्थ्य 15 कि० ग्रा० प्रति 5 से० मी० चौड़ी और बाने की ओर 12 कि० ग्रा० प्रति 5 से० मीटर चौड़ी होगी।

4. नम्य विदारण का प्रतिरोध—विभिन्न श्रेणियों के लिए अविरत नम्य चक्रों की न्यूनतम संख्या निम्नलिखित होगी।

श्रेणी	नम्य चक्रों की संख्या
क	50,000
ख	30,000
ग	20,000

चक्रों की अनुबंधित संख्या के लिए अविरत रूप से नम्य करने के पर्याप्त स्पष्टी यह सुनिश्चित करने हुए लगाई जाएगी कि वह मूल फौजिक तक न पहुँचें। तथापि नम्य विदारण के प्रतिरोध के लिए यह आवश्यक नहीं है कि प्रत्येक परंपण का परीक्षण किया जाए। यह परीक्षण प्रत्येक निर्यातकर्ता के लिए एक जैसी सामग्री के पाँच परंपणों में एक बार किया जा सकता है।

5. पी० बी० सी० मेजपोश—पी० बी० सी० मेजपोश, पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का एक टुकड़ा है, जिसे मेजपोशों के रूप में प्रयोग के लिए एक निश्चित आकार में काटा गया है। पी० बी० सी० मेजपोश के निरीक्षण को प्रक्रिया साधारणतया वैसी ही होगी जैसा कि पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े की है। पी० बी० सी० मेजपोश की परीक्षा निम्नलिखित की दृष्टि में की जाएगी :—

- (1) पी० बी० सी० विलेपन का भार और चर्म कपड़े का कुल भार।
- (2) विमाण।
- (3) डिजाइन, रंग तथा गेड।

(4) किताबों के पाग को परिसज्जा ।

(5) मुख्य और गौण दोष जो पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के लिए अधिकृत किए गए हैं ।

6. पैकिंग :—पैकिंग का ढंग केता द्वारा यथा विनिर्दिष्ट होगा । रोलों के पैकेज बंडल जल्दी प्रकार तथा मजदूती से बांधे जाएंगे जिससे कि उनके आकार में परिवर्तन न हो सके । पैकेजों को जल रोधी पालिथीन या पी० वी० सी० शीट से ढका जाएगा जिससे कि उनकी अन्तः-वस्तुओं का क्षतिग्रस्त होना संभव है प्रतिकार किया जा सके ।

[मं० 6(42)/72--नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

S.O. 48.—Whereas for the development of the export trade of India certain proposals for subjecting P. V. C. leather cloth to quality control and inspection prior to export were published as required by sub-rule (2) of rule 11 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1964, in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub Section (ii) dated the 20th October, 1979 under the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S. O. 3541 dated the 20th October, 1979.

And whereas the objections and suggestions were invited from all persons likely to be affected thereby; within 45 days of the publication of the said Order in the official Gazette.

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette were made available to the public on the 20th October, 1979 ;

And whereas the objections and suggestions received from the public on the said draft proposals have been considered by the Central Government ;

Now, therefore, the Central Government, after consultation with the Export Inspection Council, being of opinion that it is necessary and expedient so to do for the development of the export trade of India, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S. O. 2376 dated the 6th August, 1966, hereby :—

- (1) notifies that P. V. C. leather cloth shall be subject to inspection prior to export.
- (2) specifies the type of inspection in accordance with the Export of P. V. C. Leather Cloth (Inspection) Rules, 1981 as the type of inspection which shall be applied to such P. V. C. leather cloth prior to their export.
- (3) recognises :—
 - (a) national and international standards and standards of other bodies recognised by Export Inspection Council.
 - (b) contractual specifications subject to the product satisfying the minimum of the characteristics specified in the Annexure to this order; and
 - (c) the specifications declared by the exporter to be the agreed specifications of the export contract between the foreign buyer and the exporter, for such export contracts as are confirmed prior to the date of publication of the order in the official Gazette and exported within a period of sixty days from that date;

As the standard specifications for P. V. C. leather cloth :
Note :

When the export contract does not indicate detailed technical requirements is or based only on samples, the exporter should furnish a written down specification.

- (4) Prohibits the export in the course of international trade of PVC leather cloth unless the same is either accompanied by a certificate of inspection issued by any of the Export Inspection Agencies established under section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) to the effect that the PVC leather cloth is export worthy in accordance with the Export of PVC Leather Cloth

(Inspection) Rules, 1980 or is affixed with a seal or mark recognised by the Central Government under section 8 of the Act.

2. Nothing in this order shall apply to the export of—

- (a) bonafide samples of P. V. C. leather cloth not exceeding Rs. 125.00 only in Free-on-Board value to the prospective buyers by land, sea or air,
- (b) consignments of P. V. C. leather cloth which might have already left the premises of the exporter or manufacturer immediately prior to the date of publication of this Order in the official Gazette.

3. In this order "P. V. C. leather cloth" means cloth made of cotton, jute, rayon, nylon or any other synthetic fabric to which a layer of suitably compounded vinyl chloride polymer or copolymer is applied either on one or on both sides by coating or lamination.

4. This order shall come into force on the date of its publication in the official Gazette.

ANNEXURE

Minimum specifications of P.V.C. Leather Cloth

1. Material and manufacture

(1) Coating—(a) P. V. C. Leather cloth shall be manufactured by coating uniformly or by lamination on one or both sides of the basic fabric a layer of suitably compounded vinyl chloride polymer or copolymer,

(b) the composition of the coating compound shall be to import the finished product the desired appearance and strength.

(c) the coating shall be non blooming, free from pin holes and other mechanical defects. It shall not be tacky and shall not have disagreeable odour.

Note : In case of Grade-C. P. V. C. Leather cloth meant for book binding purposes, the pin-holes although visible but not permeable to water, will be allowed.

(2) Basic fabric—The basic fabric used for this purpose shall be of good quality, construction and strength. It shall be clean and reasonably free from weaving and manufacturing defects so that no major visual defects are observed on the finished coating.

(3) Appearance—The material shall conform strictly to the buyer's written down specifications or approved samples in respect of

(i) colour or shade of the coating or basic fabric.

(ii) design, grain or print of the coating.

(vii) Creases in the centre or there about more than defects as classified below. The minor defects, classified below, shall however be allowed under the conditions that—

(a) these are localised to very small areas and do not generally impair the properties or quality of the product ;

(b) Maximum of 10 minor defects may be allowed in each roll of 40 metres or more for Grade-A and B P. V. C. leather cloth.

Note : In case of Grade-C P. V. C. leather cloth when used for book binding proposes, one minor defect per metre will be allowed.

(c) in case of table covers of P. V. C. leather cloth one minor defect may be allowed in one dozen pieces inspected.

Classification of minor defects :

- (i) Scratches, cutting marks and holes.
- (ii) Printing defects repeated at regular intervals.
- (iii) Uncoated patches/lines.
- (iv) Channel lines and stop marks.
- (v) Shade variation on coated surface.
- (vi) Defective selvedge affecting the minimum width.
- (vii) Tacky surface.

(viii) Creases in the centre or their about more than 10cms in length.

(ix) Uneven coating.

(x) Uneven embossing which affects the physical appearance.

Classification of minor defects :

(i) Presence of marks of oil drops and stains up to 10 mm in diameter.

(ii) Coating lines of length upto 10 cms.

(iii) Minor weaving defects arising out of defects in the fabric like weaving, knots, long ends and slubs, loose threads, kettles for Grade-A and B P. V. C. leather cloth only. These may not be considered as defects in Grade-C P. V. C. leather cloth when the same is required to be used for book binding purposes.

(iv) Small creases less than 10 cm in length.

(v) Faults outside the standard width.

(vi) Border folded at the ends.

(vii) Defective selvage not affecting the minimum width e.g. cut distorted, lumpy, curled etc.

(viii) Backside coating not affecting the physical appearance.

(ix) Slight uneven embossing not affecting the physical appearance.

(x) Slightly flushed print out affecting the physical appearance.

(4) Dimensions of P.V.C. leather cloth rolls or table cloth shall be as specified by the buyer. A tolerance upto 5 per cent shall, however, be permitted on the contractual specifications in respect of the width of the rolls or size of the table cloth.

2. Weights of P.V.C. coating and total weight of leather cloth.

(i) Total weight:—The minimum total weight in gms./sq. metre of three grades of P.V.C. leather cloth shall be as follows :

Grade	Minimum total weight in gms./sq. mt.
A	400
B	300
C	200

(ii) P.V.C. coating—A tolerance of plus 15 per cent and—5 per cent shall be allowed on declared P.V.C. coating weight.

3. Breaking strength—The minimum breaking strength of three grades of P.V.C. leather cloth shall be as follows :

Grade	Minimum Breaking strength in kg./5 cm. width Warp direction	Weft direction
A	30	25
B	15	15
C	12	10

Note : In case of P.V.C. leather cloth manufactured with Rayon background and having coating of A grade i.e. minimum of 400 grams per square metre, and 12 Kg. per 5 cm. width in weft direction.

4. Resistance to flex cracking:—The minimum of continuous flexing cycles for different D grades shall be as under :—

Grade	No. of flexing cycles
A	50,000
B	30,000
C	20,000

After continuous flexing for the stipulated number of cycles ink shall be applied to ensure that the same does not percolate upto the basic fabric. However, the test resistance to flex cracking need not be done on every consignment. This test could be done once in five consignments of similar materials for each exporter.

5. P.V.C. table cloth:—P.V.C. table cloth is a piece of P.V.C. leather cloth, cut into a definite size for use as table covers. The procedure to be followed for inspection of P.V.C. table cloth shall in general, be the same as for P.V.C. leather cloth. The P.V.C. table cloth shall be examined for :—

(i) weights of P.V.C. coating and total weight of leather cloth.

(ii) dimensions.

(iii) design, colour and shade.

(iv) finish along the selvages.

(v) major and minor defects as laid down for P.V.C. leather cloth.

6. Packing : Mode of packing shall be as specified by the buyer : The packages as bundles containing the rolls shall be well closed and sturdy enough to retain shape. The packages shall be covered with water proof paper, polythene or P.V.C. sheeting to protect the contents from environmental hazards.

[No. 6(42)/72-EI&EP]

का० आ० 49.—केन्द्रीय सरकार नियति (कालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़ा नियति (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1966 का अधिष्ठापन करते हुए, निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ :—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़ा नियति (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1981 है,

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे ।

2. परिभाषा:—इन नियमों में, जब तक कि संदर्भ से, अन्यथा अपेक्षित न हो :—

(क) “अधिनियम” से (नियति कालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) अभिप्रेत है :—

(ख) “अधिकरण” से अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन कलकत्ता, मुम्बई, दिल्ली, मद्रास तथा कोचीन में स्थापित अधिकरणों में से कोई अधिकरण अभिप्रेत है ।

(ग) “परिपक्व” से इस अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अधीन स्थापित नियति निरीक्षण परिपक्व अभिप्रेत है :—

(घ) “पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े” से कपास, पटसन, रेयन, नायलोन या अन्य किसी संश्लिष्ट कृत्रिम से बना ऐसा कपड़ा अभिप्रेत है जिसके एक ओर या दोनों ओर उपयुक्त संयोजित आधुनिक क्लोराइड बहुलक (पॉलिमर) या सहबहुलक का लेप किया गया है या परत चढ़ाई गई है ।

(ङ) “अनुसूची” से इन नियमों से संलग्न अनुसूची अभिप्रेत है ।

3. निरीक्षण का आधार :—पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का निरीक्षण यह देखने के विचार से किया जाएगा कि नियति के लिए पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का परीक्षण, अधिनियम की धारा 6 के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार

द्वारा मान्यता प्राप्त विनिर्देशों के अनुरूप है या नहीं, अर्थात् (क) नियमित निरीक्षण परिषद् द्वारा मान्यता प्राप्त राष्ट्रीय और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मानक तथा अन्य संस्थाओं के मानक, (ख) अधिनियम की धारा 6 के अधीन इस आदेश के उपबंध में विनिर्दिष्ट न्यूनतम विशेषताओं का समाधान करने वाले उत्पाद के वांछितकारी विनिर्देश, (ग) नियमितकर्ता द्वारा घोषित ऐसे विनिर्देश, जो नियमितकर्ता तथा विदेशी क्रेता के बीच नियमित सौदा के विनिर्देशों के रूप में, ऐसी नियमित संधिवाचों के लिए जिनकी राजपत्र में इस आदेश के प्रकाशन की तारीख से पूर्व मुद्रित की गई है तथा उन तारीख से साठ दिन की अवधि के भीतर नियमित कर दिया गया है, करार पाए गए हों।

4. निरीक्षण की प्रक्रिया :—(1)(क) पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का नियमित करने का आशय रखने वाला नियमितकर्ता, पोत भरण की प्रत्याशित तारीख से कम पांच दिन पहले, अपने ऐसा करने के आशय की लिखित जानकारी देगा तथा नियमित संविदा में, अनुबंधित विनिर्देशों के अनुसार, उम्मीद कवालिटी तथा डिजाइन के पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के जो नियमित किए जाने के लिए आशयित हैं, नमूनों के साथ एक आवेदन उस अधिकरण को देगा जिसकी अधिकारिता में विनिर्माता का परिचर या वह परिचर स्थित है जहाँ निरीक्षण के लिए माल प्रस्तुत किया जाता है जिससे कि अधिकरण नियम 3 के अनुसार निरीक्षण कर सके।

(ख) आवेदन में निम्नलिखित के संबंध में नमूने के विनिर्देशों को उप-दर्शित किया जाएगा :—

- (i) ब्रिगेन का भार तथा पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का कुल भार;
- (ii) कपड़े की विभाग, चौड़ाई, बुनावट, क्वालिटी तथा रंग या ग्रेड;
- (iii) विशेषज्ञ साक्ष्य तथा नम्य विदारण के लिए प्रतिरोध।

(2) उप नियम (1) के अधीन नमूने के साथ सूचना तथा आवेदन प्राप्त होने पर अधिकरण, नियमित निरीक्षण परिषद् द्वारा नियम 3 के अनुसार समय-समय पर जारी किए गए अनुदेशों के अनुसार पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के परेपण का निरीक्षण करेगा। नमूना लेने के मापदंड तथा परीक्षण की रीति इन नियमों से उपाखंड अनुसूची के अनुसार होगी।

(3) यदि निरीक्षण के पश्चात् अधिकरण का यह समाधान हो जाता है कि पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का परेपण उससे संबंधित घोषणा के अनुरूप है, तो वह पांच दिन के भीतर यह घोषणा करते हुए, कि परेपण नियमित योग्य है प्रमाण पत्र देगा :

परन्तु जहाँ अधिकरण का ऐसा समाधान नहीं होता वहाँ वह उपर पांच दिन की अवधि के भीतर ऐसा प्रमाणपत्र देने से इकार कर देगा तथा ऐसे इकार की सूचना उसके कारणों सहित, नियमितकर्ता को देगा।

5. मान्यताप्राप्त चिह्न का लगाया जाना और उसके लिए प्रक्रिया :— नियमित के लिए आशयित पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े पर मान्यता प्राप्त चिह्न या मुद्रा लगाने की प्रक्रिया के संबंध में, भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) नियम, 1952 (1952 का 36) भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) नियम, 1958 तथा भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) विनियम, 1955 के उपबंध, जहाँ तक हो सके, लागू होंगे।

6. निरीक्षण का स्थान :—इन नियमों के अधीन प्रत्येक निरीक्षण या तो,—

- (i) माल के विनिर्माता के परिचर पर किया जाएगा; या
- (ii) उन परिचरों पर किया जाएगा जहाँ निरीक्षण के लिए नियमितकर्ता द्वारा मान प्रस्तुत किया जाता है, परन्तु यह जब कि इस प्रयोजन के लिए वहाँ पर्याप्त सुविधाएँ हैं।

7. निरीक्षण फीस :—इन नियमों के अधीन ऐसे प्रत्येक परेपण के लिए पोत-पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के प्रत्येक एक सौ रुपये के लिए तीस पैसे की दर से निरीक्षण फीस दी जाएगी किन्तु प्रत्येक परेपण के लिए यह फीस कम से कम 15 रुपये और अधिक से अधिक 200 रुपये होगी।

यदि नियमितकर्ता पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के एक ही क्वालिटी के दो या अधिक परेपण किसी विशेष तारीख का प्रस्तुत करता है तो ऐसे सभी परेपणों का निरीक्षण साथ-साथ एक लाट के रूप में किया जाएगा और एक साथ जाड़े गए ऐसे परेपणों की निरीक्षण फीस उनके पोत-पर्यन्त निःशुल्क कुल मूल्य के आधार पर ली जाएगी और यह कम से कम 15 रुपए होगी। दूसरे शब्दों में इन परेपणों के लिए निरीक्षण फीस अलग-अलग नहीं ली जाएगी।

8 अपील :—(1) नियम 4 के उपनियम (3) के अधीन प्रमाणपत्र देने से अधिकरण द्वारा इकार किए जाने से व्यथित कोई व्यक्ति, उसके विरुद्ध अपील, इस प्रकार इकार किए जाने की सूचना प्राप्त होने से दस दिन के भीतर, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा इस प्रशासन के लिए नियुक्त विशेषज्ञों के पैनल का कार सकेता जिसमें कम से कम तीन और अधिक से अधिक सति व्यथित होंगे।

(2) विशेषज्ञों के पैनल की कुल सदस्य संख्या के कम से कम दो तिहाई सदस्य, गैर-सरकारी होंगे।

(3) पैनल की गणपूर्ति तीन सदस्यों में होगी।

(4) अपील का निपटारा, उसके प्राप्त होने से, पंद्रह दिन के भीतर कर दिया जाएगा।

अनुसूची

[नियम 4(2) देखिए]

1. नमूना लेने के मापदंड

1.1 यदि नियमित संविदा में अन्यथा विनिर्दिष्ट न हो तो निरीक्षण के लिए प्रस्थापित परेपणों के विभिन्न लाटों में से पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के प्रतिनिधि नमूने लेने के लिए एक साथ प्रत्येक लाट में से लिए जाने वाले बंडलों/पैकेजों की न्यूनतम संख्या नीचे दी गई सारणी-1 के अनुसार होगी :—

नमूना लेने के मापदंड

सारणी—1

प्रस्थापित बंडलों/पैकेजों की संख्या (लाट आकार)	एक साथ चुने जाने वाले बंडलों/ पैकेजों की संख्या
10 तक	1
11 से 50 तक	2
51 से 100 तक	3
101 से 200 तक	4
201 से 300 तक	5
301 तथा उससे अधिक	7

टिप्पण—इस संदर्भ में लाट से एक ही श्रेणी तथा क्वालिटी के पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के एक साथ बांधे गए सभी रोल अभिप्रेत होंगे। एक लाट में अवयव-अवयव डिजाइन तथा रंग भी हो सकते हैं।

1.2 नमूने ऐसे लिए जाएंगे कि उनमें प्रत्येक आकार, डिजाइन तथा ग्रेड का, जहाँ तक संभव है नमूना आ जाए।

1.3 उपर सारणी के अनुसार किसी लाट में से चुने गए बंडलों/पैकेजों में के प्रत्येक रोल की :—

(क) नियमितकर्ता की घोषणा के अनुसार, उसकी चौड़ाई के लिए परीक्षा की जाएगी।

- (ख) निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा प्रस्तुत किए गए अनुमोदित नमूने के अनुसार पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के रंग तथा डिजाइन की परीक्षा की जाएगी।
- (ग) अधिनियम की धारा 6 के अधीन, आदेश के उपाबंध के खंड-1 (3) के अधीन किए गए अधीकरण के अनुसार मुख्य तथा ग्रांथ दोषों का ध्यान में रखते हुए, रोलों का निरीक्षण किया जाएगा।

1.4 इस प्रकार निरीक्षण किए गए उक्त रोलों में से प्रयोगशाला परीक्षण के लिए, नमूना लेने के निम्नलिखित मापदंड अपनाए जाएंगे :—

लॉट में रोलों की संख्या	लिए जाने वाले नमूने
50 तक	2
51 से 100 तक	3
101 से 300 तक	5
301 तथा उसमें अधिक	7

1.5 प्रयोगशाला परीक्षण के लिए नमूनों के दो सैट लिए जाएंगे। यदि नमूने का एक सैट अपेक्षित विनिर्देशों के अनुरूप नहीं है तो इस प्रकार लिए गए दूसरे सैट का परीक्षण किया जाएगा और परेक्षण की नियत योग्यता या अन्यथा उसके अनुसार सुनिश्चित की जाएगी।

1.6 नमूनों के दो सैट लेने के लिए, नमूने विभिन्न रोलों से (यदि अपेक्षित हों तो, खुले हुए बंडलों तथा अतिरिक्त बंडलों में से) भी यह सुनिश्चित करने हुए लिए जाएंगे कि अधिक से अधिक यथा संभव रंगों तथा डिजाइनों के नमूने प्राप्त हों जाएं।

2. पी० बी० सी० मेज पोश :

2.1 पी० बी० सी० मेजपोश का सम्पूर्ण परेक्षण, नमूना लेने के प्रयोजन के लिए, विभिन्न लॉटों में बाटा जाएगा। इस संदर्भ में लॉट से समान श्रेणी तथा क्वालिटी के सभी टुकड़े अभिप्रेत हैं।

2.2 नीचे दिए गए नमूना लेने के मापदंड के अनुसार निरीक्षण करने के लिए नमूना लेने के लिए कम से कम पांच प्रतिगण पैकेज; किन्तु दो पैकेज से कम नहीं, खोले जाएंगे।

2.3 नमूने इस रंग से लिए जाएंगे कि उनमें प्रत्येक आकार, डिजाइन तथा शेड का नमूना आ जाए।

नमूना लेने का मापदंड

लॉट में मेजपोशों की संख्या	प्रत्यक्ष निरी- क्षण के लिए, लिए जाने वाले मेज पोशों की संख्या	प्रयोगशाला परीक्षण के लिए, लिए जाने वाले मेजपोशों की संख्या	
(1)	(2)	3(क)	3(ख)
300 तक	10	1	3
301 से 600 तक	15	2	4
601 से 1200 तक	20	2	5
1201 तथा उसमें अधिक	25	3	6

टिप्पण :—उक्त स्तम्भ 3(ख) उस पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के एक ही रोल के विभिन्न बिंदुओं से पी० बी० सी० मेजपोशों के लिए ली जाने वाली उन पट्टियों की संख्या बताता है, जिसमें से परेक्षण के मेजपोश बनाए गए हैं। निर्यातकर्ता से प्रत्येक मामले में यह घोषणा अवश्य प्राप्त कर ली जानी चाहिए कि ये कटवोस उसी क्वालिटी के हैं जिसके कि मेजपोश हैं। इन कटवोसों और उपर स्तम्भ 3 (क) के अनुसार परेक्षण में से लिए गए पूरे परिमप के मेजपोशों का, प्रयोगशाला परीक्षण किया जाएगा और जहाँ तक प्रयोगशाला परीक्षणों का संबंध है, औसत परिणामों से ही निर्यात योग्यता सुनिश्चित की जाएगी।

3. परीक्षण-पद्धति :—यदि निर्यात संविदा में अन्यथा विनिर्दिष्ट नहीं है तो परीक्षण प्रक्रिया, राष्ट्रीय मानक के अनुसार होगी। यह सुनिश्चित करने के लिए नमूनों का नवी प्रकार परीक्षण किया जाएगा कि परेक्षण इस प्रयोजन के लिए मान्यता प्राप्त मानक विनिर्देशों की अपेक्षाओं के अनुरूप हैं।

[सं० 6(42)/72-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

S.O. 49.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) and in supersession of the Export of P.V.C. Leather Cloth (Inspection) Rules, 1966 the Central Government hereby makes the following rules, namely :—

1. Short title and commencement.—(1) These rules may be called the Export of P. V. C. Leather Cloth (Inspection) Rules, 1981.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the official Gazette.

2. Definitions : In this rule, unless the context otherwise requires :—

(a) "Act" means the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963).

(b) "Agency" means any one of the agencies established at Calcutta, Bombay, Delhi, Madras and Cochin under section 7 of the Act.

(c) "Council" means the Export Inspection Council established under section 3 of the Act;

(d) "PVC leather cloth" means cloth made of cotton, jute, rayon, nylon or any other synthetic fabric to which a layer of suitably compounded vinyl chloride polymer or copolymer is applied either on one or on both sides by coating or lamination.

(e) "Schedule" means a Schedule appended to these rules.

3. Basis of inspection.—Inspection of P. V. C. leather cloth shall be carried out with a view to seeing that the consignment of P.V.C. leather cloth intended for export conforms to the specifications recognised by the Central Government under section 6 of the Act, namely (a) national and international standards and standards of other bodies recognised by Export Inspection Council (b) contractual specifications subject to the product satisfying the minimum of the characteristics specified in the Annexure to the order under section 6 of the Act, and (c) the specifications declared by the exporter to be the agreed specifications of the export contract between the foreign buyer and the exporter, for such export contracts as are confirmed prior to the date of publication of this order in the Official Gazette and exported within a period of sixty days from that date.

4. Procedure of inspection.—(1) (a) An exporter intending to export P. V. C. leather cloth shall not less than five days before the expected date of shipment, give information in writing of his intention so to do and submit an application along with the sample of PVC leather cloth of the same quality and design as is intended to be exported in accordance with the specifications stipulated in the export contract to the Agency within whose jurisdiction the premises of the manufacturer or the premises where the goods are offered for inspection are situated in order to enable it to carry out the inspection in accordance with rule 3.

(b) The application shall also indicate the specifications of the sample in respect of :—

(i) the weight of coating and total weight of PVC leather cloth ;

(ii) the dimension, width, texture of the piece, quality and colour or shade

(iii) the breaking strength and resistance to flex cracking.

(2) On receipt of the intimation and application along with the sample under sub-rule (1), the agency shall inspect the consignment of PVC leather cloth as per the instructions issued by the Export Inspection Council from time to time and in accordance with rule 3. The sampling criteria and methods of test shall be as per the schedule annexed to these rules.

(3) If after inspection, the agency is satisfied that the consignment of PVC leather cloth conforms to the declaration relating to the consignment, it shall within five days, issue a certificate declaring the consignment as exportworthy.

Provided that where the agency is not so satisfied, it shall, within the said period of five days, refuse to issue such certificate and communicate such refusal to the exporters along with reasons therefor.

5. Affixation of recognised mark and procedure therefor.—The Provisions of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 (36 of 1952), the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules 1955 and the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulation 1955 shall, so far as may, apply in relation to the procedure of affixation of the recognised mark or seal on P. V. C. leather cloth meant for export.

6. Place of inspection :—Every inspection under these rules shall be carried out either :—

- at the premises of the manufacturer of the goods, or
- at the premises at which the goods are offered by the exporter for inspection provided adequate facilities for the purpose exist therein

7. Inspection fee—subject to a minimum of Rs. 15/- and a maximum of Rs. 200/- for each consignment, a fee at the rate of thirty paise for every hundred rupees of the f.o.b. value for each such consignment shall be paid as inspection fee under these rules.

In case the exporter offers two or more consignments of P. V. C. leather cloth of the same quality for inspection on a particular date, all such consignments shall be inspected simultaneously as one lot and the inspection fee shall be charged on the basis of f.o.b. value of such consignments added together subject to the minimum of Rs. 15/-. In other words the inspection fee shall not be charged for each of these consignments separately.

8. Appeal—(1) Any person aggrieved by the refusal of the Agency to issue a certificate under sub rule (3) of rule 4, may within ten days of the receipt of the communication of such refusal by him, prefer appeal to the panel of experts consisting of not less than three but not more than seven persons, appointed for the purpose by the Central Government.

(2) At least two thirds of the total membership of the panel of experts shall consist of non-officials.

(3) The quorum of the Panel shall be three.

(4) The appeal shall be disposed of within fifteen days of its receipt.

SCHEDULE

[See rule 4(2)]

1. Sampling criteria

1.1. For drawing representative samples of the P.V.C. leather cloth from various lots in the consignment offered for inspection minimum number of bundles of packages to be selected from each lot at random shall be in accordance with Table-I given below if not otherwise specified in the export contract :—

Scale of Sampling

TABLE—I

No. of bundles/packages offered (lot size)	No. of bundles/packages to be selected at random
Up to 10	1
11 to 50	2
51 to 100	3
101 to 200	4
201 to 300	5
301 and above	7

Note.—A lot in this context shall mean all the rolls of the P.V.C. leather cloth of the same grade and quality grouped together. There may be different designs and colours in the same lot

1.2 The samples shall be so drawn that each size, design and shade is well represented as far as possible.

1.3 Each of the rolls contained in the bundles/packages thus selected from the same lot according to the above table shall be examined :—

- for width, according to the declaration of the exporter.
- for colour and design of the P.V.C. leather cloth in accordance with the approved sample submitted by the exporter.
- The rolls shall be inspected keeping in view the major and minor defects, as classified under clause 1 (3) of the annexure of the Order under section 6 of the Act.

1.4 From the above rolls, thus examined, the following scale of sampling shall be followed for laboratory tests :—

No. of rolls in the lot	Samples to be taken
Up to 50	2
51 to 100	3
101 to 300	5
301 and above	7

1.5 A duplicate set of samples shall be drawn for laboratory testing. In case first set of samples do not conform to the required specifications then the duplicate set of samples so drawn shall be tested and export-worthiness or otherwise of the consignment shall be decided accordingly.

1.6 For drawing duplicate set of samples, samples from different rolls (from the selected bundles and also additional bundles, if required) shall be drawn ensuring coverage of as many colours and designs as possible.

2. P.V.C. table cloth

2.1 The whole consignment of P.V.C. table cloth shall be divided into various lots for sampling purpose. A lot in this context means all the pieces of the same grade and quality.

2.2 At least 5 per cent of the packages, subject to a minimum of two shall be opened for drawing samples for inspection as per the scale of sampling given below.

2.3 The samples shall be so drawn that each size, design and shade is well represented.

Scale of Sampling

No. of Table cloths in the lot	No. of table cloths to be drawn for visual inspection	No. of table cloths to be drawn for laboratory tests	
(1)	(2)	3(a)	3(b)
Up to 300	10	1	3
301 to 600	15	2	4
601 to 1200	20	2	5
1201 and above	25	3	6

Note.—Column 3(b) above, give the number of strips of P.V.C. table cloth to be drawn from different points on the same roll of P.V.C. leather cloth out of which the table cloths of the consignment have been fabricated. The exporter's declaration that these cut pieces are of the same quality as the table cloths should invariably be obtained in each case. The cut pieces shall be put to laboratory tests together with the all size table cloth drawn from the consignment as per column 3(a) above and the average results shall determine the export worthiness, so far as laboratory testings are involved.

3. Methods of testing.—If not otherwise specified in the export contract the testing procedure shall be as per National Standard. The samples shall be subjected to all tests to ensure the conformity of the consignment with the requirements of standard specifications recognised for the purpose.

[No. 6(42)/72-EI&EP]

का० आ० 50.—केन्द्रीय सरकार नियमित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत के राजपत्र, असाधारण, भाग, 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 6 अगस्त, 1966 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 2378 का अधिक्रमण करते हुए निम्नलिखित अभिकरणों को पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के, उसके निर्यात से पूर्व, निरीक्षण के लिए मान्यता देती है, अर्थात्—

1. निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण-कलकत्ता,
'ब्लैक ट्रेड सेंटर',
14/बी० एजरा स्ट्रीट (एड्यु प्लोर)
कलकत्ता-700001
2. निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण-मद्रास,
123, माउंट रोड,
मद्रास-600006
3. निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण-कोचीन,
मनोहर बिल्डिंग, महात्मा गांधी रोड,
एरनाकुलम, कोचीन-11.
4. निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण-मुम्बई,
अमन चैम्बर्स (फोर्थ फ्लोर)
113, महर्षि कर्वे रोड,
मुम्बई-400004.
5. निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण-दिल्ली,
म्युनिमिपल मार्केट बिल्डिंग,
3, सरस्वती मार्ग, करोल बाग,
नई दिल्ली-110005.

स्पष्टीकरण.—इस अनुदेश में पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े से कपास, पटसन, रेयन, नायलोन या अन्य किसी संश्लिष्ट कपड़े से बना वह कपड़ा अभिप्रेत है जिसके एक ओर या दोनों ओर उपयुक्त संयोजित वाणिज्य क्लोराइड बहुलक (पॉलिमर) या बहुबहुलक का लेप किया गया है या परत चढ़ाई गई है।

[सं० 6 (42)/72-नि० नि० तथा नि० ई०उ०]

S.O. 50.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 2378 published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, section 3, Sub Section (ii) dated the 6th August, 1966, the Central Government, hereby, recognises the following agencies for inspection of PVC leather cloth prior to its export, namely :—

1. Export Inspection Agency-Calcutta World Trade Centre, 14/1B Ezra Street (8th Floor) Calcutta-700001.
2. Export Inspection Agency-Madras 123, Mount Road, Madras-600006.
3. Export Inspection Agency-Cochin, Manohar Building, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Ernakulam, Cochin-11.
4. Export Inspection Agency-Bombay Aman Chambers (4th floor), 113, M. Karve Road, Bombay-400 004.
5. Export Inspection Agency-Delhi, Municipal Market Building, 3, Saraswati Marg, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005.

Explanation.—In this notification P. V. C. leather cloth means cloth made of cotton, Jute, rayon, nylon or any other synthetic fabric to which a layer of suitably compounded vinyl chloride polymer or copolymer is applied either on one or on both sides by coating or lamination.

[No. 6(42)/72-EI&EP]

का० आ० 51.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने नियमित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 8 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए नियमित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 11 के उपनियम (2) द्वारा अपेक्षित रूप में पी० वी० सी० चर्म के कपड़े के संबंध में भारतीय मानक संस्था प्रमाणित चिह्न को मान्यता देने के लिए एक प्रस्ताव भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय के आदेश सं० का० आ० 3542 तारीख 20 अक्टूबर 1979 के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3 उपखंड (ii) तारीख 20 अक्टूबर, 1979 में प्रकाशित किया था।

और उक्त अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से 45 दिन के भीतर उन सभी व्यक्तियों से आक्षेप और सुझाव मांगे गए थे, जिनके उससे प्रभावित होने की संभावना थी।

और उक्त राजपत्र की प्रतियां 29 अक्टूबर, 1979 को जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त प्रारूप पर जनता से प्राप्त आक्षेपों और सुझावों पर विचार कर लिया है।

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार नियमित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 की धारा 8 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के संबंध में भारतीय मानक संस्था प्रमाणित चिह्न को यह घोषित करने के प्रयोजन के लिए मान्यता देती है कि जहाँ पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े पर ऐसा चिह्न चिपकाया या लगाया जाता है, वहाँ यह समझा जाएगा कि वह उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 के खंड (3) के अधीन उसको लागू मानक विनिर्देशों के अनुरूप है।

स्पष्टीकरण.—इस आदेश में पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े से कपास, पटसन, रेयन, नायलोन या अन्य किसी संश्लिष्ट फेब्रिक से बना वह कपड़ा अभिप्रेत है जिसके एक ओर या दोनों ओर उपयुक्त संयोजित वाणिज्य क्लोराइड बहुलक (पॉलिमर) या बहुबहुलक का लेप किया गया है या परत चढ़ाई गई है।

[सं० 6 (42)/72-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]
पी० वी० सी० कुकरेती, संयुक्त निदेशक

S.O. 51.—Whereas the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by section 8 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) published a proposal to recognise the Indian Standards Institution Certification Mark in relation to P. V. C. leather cloth as required by sub-rule (2) of rule 11 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1964 in the Gazette of India, Part II-Section 3-sub-section (ii), dated the 20th October 1979, under the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 3542, dated the 20th October, 1979.

And whereas objections and suggestions were invited from all persons likely to be affected thereby within 45 days from the date of publication of the said notification in the official Gazette.

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette were made available to the public on the 29th October, 1979.

And whereas the objections and suggestions received from the public on the said draft have been considered by the Central Government.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 8 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby recognises the Indian Standards Institution Certification Mark in relation to P. V. C. Leather cloth for the purpose of denoting that

where P.V.C. leather cloth are affixed or applied with such mark, they shall be deemed to be in conformity with standard specifications applicable thereto, under clause (3) of section 6 of the said Act.

Explanation—In this notification “P.V.C. leather cloth” means cloth made of cotton, jute, rayon, nylon or any other synthetic fabric to which a layer of suitably compounded vinyl chloride polymer or copolymer is applied either on one or on both sides by coating or lamination.

[No. 6(42)/72-EI&EP]

C. B. KUKRETI, Joint Director

मुख्य निर्यातक आयात निर्यात का कार्यालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 16 दिसम्बर, 1980

क्रा०अ० 52.—सर्वश्री उप मुख्य अभियन्ता (एम एण्ड पी), प० बंगाल, राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड, कलकत्ता को आई०डी०ए० अणु सं० 604-आई एन के अन्तर्गत प्रयोगशाला परीक्षण उपकरण का आयात करने के लिए डी०एम० 80651 के तहत 3,75,320 रु० (तीन लाख पचहत्तर हजार तीन सौ बीस रुपए मात्र) जो बाद में घटाकर 3,06,658/- रुपए कर दिए गए थे, के लिए आयात लाइसेंस सं० जी०एच०/2033831/एमआईए/67/एच/78/सी जी-2/एनएम, दिनांक 12-5-78 प्रदान किया गया था। पार्टी ने उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रति जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा शुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई अथवा अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। आगे यह भी बताया गया है कि लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति किसी भी पत्तन प्राधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत नहीं कराई गई थी और इस प्रकार सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति बिम्बुन भी उपयोग में नहीं लाई गई है।

2. अपने तर्कों के समर्थन में लाइसेंसधारी ने नोटरी पब्लिक (क्रम सं० 145/80 बैकशेल कोर्ट) कलकत्ता के समक्ष विशिष्ट शपथ भेजे हुए स्टाम्प कागज पर एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। तदनुसार, मैं सन्तुष्ट हूँ कि आयात लाइसेंस सं० जी०एच०/2033831, दिनांक 12-5-78 की मूल सीमा शुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है अथवा अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। यथा सहायित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 की उप-कंडिका 9 (सी० सी०) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए सर्वश्री प० बंगाल, राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड, कलकत्ता के नाम से जारी किए

नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय

(नागरिक पूर्ति विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 16 दिसम्बर, 1980

भारतीय मानक संस्था

क्रा०अ० 53.—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणचिह्न) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 14 के उपविनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिलेखित किया जाता है कि लाइसेंस संस्था सी०एम०एल-7473 जिसके ब्यौरे नीचे अनुसूची में दिये गये हैं 1979-04-07 से रद्द कर दिया गया है क्योंकि फर्म लाइसेंस जारी रखने की इच्छुक नहीं है।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या और तिथि	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	रद्द किये गये लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु/प्रक्रिया	तत्संबंधी भारतीय मानक
1	2	3	3	5
1.	सी एम/एल-7473 1979-01-10	सैमस गालरा काटीन्यूअस कार्बोस्टम लि० पी 2/6 आई डी ए ब्लॉक III उपपल हैदराबाद-500039 (आन्ध्र प्रदेश)	सामान्य इंजीनियरी कार्यों के लिये एलुमिनियम मिश्र द्रव्य मिश्र धातु पदनाम : केबल 4420	IS : 617—1975 सामान्य इंजीनियरी कार्यों के लिये एलुमिनियम और एलुमिनियम मिश्र धातु हंगट और हली वस्तुओं की विशिष्टि। (दूसरा पृथरीक्षण)

[स० सी एम डी/55: 7473]

ए० पी० बनर्जी, अपर महानिदेशक

गए आयात लाइसेंस सं० जी०एच०/2033831, दिनांक 12-5-78 की मूल सीमा शुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति एतद्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

3. पार्टी को अलग से उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रति जा रही जारी की जा रही है।

[स० सी०जी० 2/एच ई पी (इन्सू बी-2)/78-79/1072]

जी० एम० ग्रेवाल, उप मुख्य निर्यात आयात-निर्यात

कृते मुख्य निर्यात आयात-निर्यात

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CONTROLLER OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

ORDER

New Delhi, the 16th December, 1980

S.O. 52.—M/s. The Deputy Chief Engineer (S&P), West Bengal State Electricity Board, Calcutta were granted an Import Licence No. G/H/2033831/S/IA/67/H/78/GGI/L.S. dated 12-5-78 for Rs. 3,75,320 which was subsequently reduced to Rs. 3,06,658 (Rupees Three lakhs Six thousand Six hundred and Fifty Eight only) equivalent to DM 80,651 for import of laboratory testing equipment under IDA Credit No. 604-IN. The firm has applied for issue of duplicate copy of Customs as well as Exchange Control Purposes copy of the above mentioned licence on the ground that the original Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes copy of the licence have been lost or misplaced. It has further been stated that the Customs and Exchange Control Purposes copy of the licence were not registered with any Customs authority and as such the value of Customs Purposes copy has not been utilised at all.

2. In support of their contention, the licensee has filed an affidavit on stamped paper duly sworn in before Notary Public (Sl. No. 145/80 Bankshall Court), Calcutta. I am accordingly satisfied that the original Customs and Exchange Control Purposes copy of import licence No. G/H/2033831 dated 12-5-1978 has been lost or misplaced by the firm. In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-clause 9(cc) of the Import (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended the said original Customs and Exchange Control Purposes copy No. G/H/2033831 dated 12-5-1978 issued to M/s. West Bengal State Electricity Board, Calcutta is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Customs and Exchange Control Purposes copy of the said licence is being issued to the party separately.

[No. CGII/HEP(WB-2)/78-79/1072]

G. S. GREWAL, Dy. Chief Controller
of Imports and Exports
for the Controller of Imports Exports

MINISTRY OF CIVIL SUPPLIES

(Deptt. of Civil Supplies)

New Delhi, the 16th December, 1980

INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION

S.O. 53 :—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations 1955 as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that Licence No. CM/L-7473 particulars of which are given below has been cancelled with effect from 1979-04-07 as the firm is not interested to operate the licence.

SCHEDULE

S. No.	Licence No. and date	Name & Address of the Licensee	Article/Process Covered by the Licensees Cancelled	Relevant Indian Standards
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	CM/L-7473 1979-01-10	M/s Galada Continuous Castings Ltd., P2/6 IDA Block III, Uppal, Hyderabad-500039(AP)	Aluminium alloy ingots for general engineering purposes alloy designation : 4420 only	IS:617-1975 Specification for aluminium and aluminium alloy ingots and castings for general engineering purposes (second revision).

[CMD/55 : 7473]

A. P. BANERJI, Additional Director General

उद्योग मंत्रालय

(भारी उद्योग विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० प्रा० 54.—सार्वजनिक परिसर (अनधिकृत दखलकारी का बेवखला) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निम्न तालिका के कालम (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को, जो सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी के समकक्ष स्तर का अधिकारी है उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए सम्पदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है और यह भी निदेश देती है कि उक्त अधिकारी उक्त तालिका के कालम (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट सार्वजनिक परिसरों के संरक्षण में अपने अधिकार क्षेत्र की सीमाओं के अन्तर्गत उक्त अधिनियम के द्वारा या अन्तर्गत सम्पदा अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेगा, और सोपे गए कर्तव्यों का पालन करेगा :—

तालिका

अधिकारी का नाम तथा पदनाम	सरकारी परिसरों की श्रेणी या तथा अधिकार क्षेत्र की स्थानीय सीमाएं
1	2
श्री के० जे० टक्कर, सचिव तथा प्रशासनिक अधिकारी रिजर्वेशन एण्ड क्रुडस (1972) लिमिटेड, (भारत सरकार का उपक्रम) बायकुला आयरन वर्क्स, सर जे० जे० राइड	रिजर्वेशन एण्ड क्रुडस (1972) लिमिटेड, बम्बई के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण में भारत में किसी भी जगह स्थित भूमि तथा भवना सहित सार्वजनिक परिसर।
बम्बई-400008	

[का० सं० 14(24)/80-गजम-4]

प्रेम बहादुर सक्सेना, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY

(Department of Heavy Industry)

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 1980

S.O. 54.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being an officer equivalent to the rank of gazetted officers of

Government, to be Estate Officer for the purposes of the said Act and further directs that the said officer shall exercise the powers conferred, and perform the duties imposed, on estate officers by or under, the said Act, within the limits of his jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table :

TABLE

Name & Designation of the Officer	Categories of public premises, and local limits of jurisdiction
(1)	(2)
Shri K. J. Thacker, Secretary and Administrative Officer, Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Limited (A Government of India Undertaking), Byculia Iron Works, Sir. J. J. Road, Bombay-400008.	Public premises including land and buildings under the administrative control of the Richardson and Cruddas (1972) Limited, Bombay, situated anywhere in India.

[F. No. 14(24)/80/HM-IV]

P. B. SAXENA, Dy. Secy.

विदेश मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 17 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० प्रा० 55.—राजनयिक एवं कोसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 41वा) की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्र सरकार, इसके द्वारा भारत का टाई कमीशन, लागोस नाइजीरिया, में निजी सहायक श्री के० सी० भाटिया को नत्काय से कोसली एजेंट का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[फाइल सं० टी० 4330/1/80]

जे० हजारी, अवग सचिव

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 17th December, 1980

S.O. 55.—In pursuance of the clause (a) of section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officer (Oaths and fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948) the Central Government hereby

authorises Shri K. C. Bhatia, Personal Assistant in the High Commission of India, Lagos, Nigeria to perform the duties of a Consular Agent with immediate effect.

[File No. T. 4330/1/80]

J. HAZARI, Under Secy.

पेट्रोलियम, रसायन और उर्वरक मंत्रालय

(पेट्रोलियम विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 17 दिसम्बर, 1980

क्र० आ० 56—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में मथुरा से जालन्धर (पंजाब) तक पेट्रोलियम पदार्थों के परिवहन के लिए पाईप लाइन इंडियन आयल कॉर्पोरेशन द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वाचक अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

वर्तते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन आयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मथुरा—जालन्धर पाईप लाईन प्रोजेक्ट, न्यू हाऊस, कुन्जपुरा मार्ग, करनाल (हरियाणा) को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

तहसील : नूह	जिला : गुड़गांव	राज्य : हरियाणा			
ग्राम का नाम	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्रफल			
			ह०	ऐ०	व०मी०
किरणज	21/20 मिन		0	04	51
ह० नं० 187	29/7 मिन		0	00	55
	29/14/2 मिन		0	01	26
	29/16 मिन		0	00	51
	29/25/1 मिन		0	08	09
	38/11/1 मिन		0	02	02
	38/11/2 मिन		0	02	53
	45/2 मिन		0	00	51

[स० 12020/20/80 प्रो०]

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM, CHEMICALS & FERTILIZER
(Department of Petroleum)

New Delhi 17th Dec. 1980

S.O. 56. —Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum products from Mathura in Uttar Pradesh to Jullundur in Punjab pipelines should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed here to ;

Now Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided That any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Mathura-Jullundur Pipeline, New House, Kunjpura Road, Karnal (Haryana).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Tahsil : Nuh	Distt : Gurgaon	State : Haryana			
Name of Village	Khasra No.	Area			
			H.	A.	Sq. M.
Kiranj H. No. 187	21/20 Min.	0	00	51	
	29/7 Min.	0	04	55	
	29/14/2 Min.	0	01	26	
	29/16 Min.	0	00	51	
	29/25/1 Min.	0	08	09	
	38/11/1 Min.	0	02	02	
	38/11/2 Min.	0	02	53	
	45/2 Min.	0	00	51	

[No. 12020/20/80-Prod]

क्र० आ० 57—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में मथुरा से जालन्धर (पंजाब) तक पेट्रोलियम पदार्थों के परिवहन के लिए पाईप लाइन इंडियन आयल कॉर्पोरेशन द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वाचक अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है :

वर्तते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन आयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड मथुरा-जालन्धर पाईप लाइन प्रोजेक्ट, न्यू हाऊस, कुन्जपुरा मार्ग, करनाल (हरियाणा) को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची					1	2	3	4	5
सहस्रमूल . पानीपत	जिला . करनाल	राज्य हरियाणा			नमोन्दा ह० न० 79	51/24/1 मिन	0	10	12
ग्राम का नाम	खसरा न०	हेक्टर	गेयर	वर्ग-मीटर		70/4/1 मिन	0	00	51
1	2	3	4	5		70/4/2 मिन	0	08	60
खुलकाना ह० न० 118	16/19 मिन	0	12	39		70/7/1 मिन	0	02	53
	16/22 मिन	0	10	12		70/7/2 मिन	0	07	08
	42/2 मिन	0	10	12		70/8 मिन	0	00	51
	42/9 मिन	0	09	61		70/13/3 मिन	0	02	53
	42/12 मिन	0	10	12		70/14/मिन	0	04	30
	42/19 मिन	0	10	12		70/17 मिन	0	06	07
	42/22 मिन	0	10	12		70/18/1 मिन	0	04	05
	48/2 मिन	0	10	12		70/23 मिन	0	05	31
	18/9 मिन	0	10	12		70/24/1 मिन	0	04	30
	48/12 मिन	0	10	12		74/3/2 मिन	0	09	11
	48/19/2 मिन	0	10	12		74/4/1 मिन	0	01	01
	48/21/2 मिन	0	00	25		74/8 मिन	0	10	12
	48/22 मिन	0	09	36		74/13 मिन	0	09	36
	75/1/1/2 मिन	0	00	51		74/18 मिन	0	10	12
	75/1/1 मिन	0	01	01		74/23 मिन	0	10	12
	75/2/1 मिन	0	02	53		91/3 मिन	0	10	12
	75/2/2 मिन	0	01	05		91/8 मिन	0	10	12
	75/9 मिन	0	06	58		91/13 मिन	0	10	12
	75/10 मिन	0	02	78		91/18/1 मिन	0	04	30
	75/11 मिन	0	05	56		91/18/2 मिन	0	05	82
	75/12/मिन	0	01	55		91/22/3 मिन	0	00	25
	75/19 मिन	0	02	28		91/23 मिन	0	09	61
	75/20/1 मिन	0	07	08		94/2/1 मिन	0	01	26
	75/21/2 मिन	0	10	12		94/2/2 मिन	0	00	25
	84/1 मिन	0	10	12		94/3/1 मिन	0	06	32
	84/10/1 मिन	0	10	12		94/8 मिन	0	05	06
	84/11 मिन	0	10	12		94/9 मिन	0	05	06
	84/20/1 मिन	0	02	02		94/12 मिन	0	06	32
	84/21 मिन	0	02	02		94/13 मिन	0	00	76
	111/1 मिन	0	10	12		123 मिन	0	03	04
	111/10/2 मिन	0	10	12		143 मिन	0	00	51
	111/11 मिन	0	10	12		290 मिन	0	00	76
	111/20 मिन	0	10	12		291 मिन	0	00	76
	111/21 मिन	0	10	12		292 मिन	0	01	77
	113/5 मिन	0	00	25		293 मिन	0	01	52
	113/6 मिन	0	01	52		295 मिन	0	00	76
	114/1 मिन	0	09	61		332 मिन	0	00	25
	114/10 मिन	0	07	33		19/25 मिन	0	01	77
	114/195 मिन	0	02	02		20/5 मिन	0	10	12
	114/223 मिन	0	00	51		20/6 मिन	0	09	36
	114/224 मिन	0	00	51		20/15/1 मिन	0	10	12
	114/225 मिन	0	00	51		20/16 मिन	0	09	61
	114/260 मिन	0	00	76		24/24/3 मिन	0	00	25
	114/329 मिन	0	00	51		24/25 मिन	0	09	61
	नमोन्दा ह० न० 79	51/4 मिन	0	05	06		39/4 मिन	0	02
51/7/1 मिन		0	08	09		39/5 मिन	0	08	09
51/7/2 मिन		0	02	02		39/6 मिन	0	05	06
51/14 मिन		0	10	12		39/7 मिन	0	04	55
51/17/1 मिन		0	06	07		39/14 मिन	0	08	09
51/17/2 मिन		0	04	05		39/15 मिन	0	02	02
						3916 मिन	0	00	00
						39/17/1 मिन	0	01	01

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
किबाना ह० न० 78	39/17/2 मिन	0	09	11	डोहपुर ह० न० 75	59/25/1 मिन	0	05	82
	39/24 मिन	0	09	36		59/25/2 मिन	0	02	02
	41/4 मिन	0	09	61		77 मिन	0	02	28
	41/7/1 मिन	0	03	51		79 मिन	0	02	28
	41/7/2 मिन	0	06	58		108 मिन	0	00	51
	41/14 मिन	0	04	30		109 मिन	0	06	58
	41/17 मिन	0	12	39		254 मिन	0	00	76
	41/24/1 मिन	0	10	12		269 मिन	0	00	76
	64/4/1 मिन	0	05	06					
	119 मिन	0	03	24	मनाना ह० न० 76	41/3/1 मिन	0	01	01
	267 मिन	0	00	51		41/8 मिन	0	08	60
	268 मिन	0	00	51		41/13 मिन	0	10	12
	269 मिन	0	00	51		41/18 मिन	0	10	12
	669 मिन	0	00	76		41/23 मिन	0	10	12
	671 मिन	0	01	52		42/3 मिन	0	10	12
डोहपुर ह० न० 75	23/10 मिन	0	01	81		42/8 मिन	0	10	12
	23/12 मिन	0	10	12		42/13/1 मिन	0	07	08
	23/19 मिन	0	09	11		42/13/2 मिन	0	03	04
	23/20 मिन	0	00	76		42/18 मिन	0	10	12
	23/21 मिन	0	03	04		42/23 मिन	0	10	12
	23/22 मिन	0	07	08		62/3/2 मिन	0	10	12
	25/1 मिन	0	05	50		62/8 मिन	0	10	12
	25/2 मिन	0	04	55		62/13 मिन	0	09	11
	25/9 मिन	0	01	52		62/18 मिन	0	08	60
	25/10/1 मिन	0	06	07		62/23 मिन	0	10	12
	25/10/2 मिन	0	02	53		63/3 मिन	0	10	12
	25/11/1 मिन	0	00	76		63/8 मिन	0	10	12
	25/11/2 मिन	0	05	06		63/13 मिन	0	10	12
	25/11/3 मिन	0	03	79		63/18 मिन	0	10	12
	25/12 मिन	0	00	25		63/23 मिन	0	10	12
	25/20 मिन	0	09	36		87/3 मिन	0	10	12
	25/21 मिन	0	10	12		87/8/2 मिन	0	09	36
	42/1 मिन	0	09	61		87/12/2 मिन	0	00	25
	42/10 मिन	0	07	54		87/13 मिन	0	09	61
	42/11 मिन	0	10	12		87/18 मिन	0	07	08
	42/20 मिन	0	10	12		87/19/1 मिन	0	03	04
	42/21 मिन	0	10	12		87/22 मिन	0	04	91
	46/1 मिन	0	09	61		87/23 मिन	0	04	81
	46/10 मिन	0	10	12		90/2/2 मिन	0	07	59
	46/11 मिन	0	10	12		90/3 मिन	0	02	53
	46/20 मिन	0	08	09		90/8/2 मिन	0	00	51
	46/21 मिन	0	05	06		90/9/1 मिन	0	08	09
	47/16 मिन	0	01	01		90/9/2 मिन	0	02	02
	47/25 मिन	0	03	04		90/12 मिन	0	10	12
	56/5 मिन	0	04	55		90/19 मिन	0	10	12
	56/6 मिन	0	07	08		90/22 मिन	0	10	12
	56/15 मिन	0	09	11		114/2 मिन	0	09	36
	56/16 मिन	0	12	65		114/9 मिन	0	10	12
	56/25 मिन	0	05	31		114/12/1 मिन	0	08	09
	57/1 मिन	0	02	78		114/12/2 मिन	0	02	02
	57/10 मिन	0	01	01		114/19 मिन	0	10	12
	59/5 मिन	0	10	12		114/22/1 मिन	0	00	76
	59/6 मिन	0	10	12		114/22/2 मिन	0	09	11
	59/15 मिन	0	10	12		117/2 मिन	0	10	12
	59/16/1 मिन	0	10	12		117/9 मिन	0	05	31

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
मनाता ह० न० 76	117/175 मिन	0	02	53	पहलादपुर खलीला ह० न० 34	121 मिन	0	08	95
	117/264 मिन	0	00	51		131 मिन	0	10	12
	117/702 मिन	0	00	76		227 मिन	0	01	26
	117/703 मिन	0	00	76		230 मिन	0	06	32
नारायणा ह० न० 74	20/10 मिन	0	04	55	बरणास ह० न० 35	231 मिन	0	08	95
	20/11 मिन मिन	0	09	61		272 मिन	0	08	85
	20/12 मिन	0	00	51		273 मिन	0	08	85
	20/19/2 मिन	0	02	02		282 मिन	0	08	85
	20/20 मिन	0	07	59		283 मिन	0	08	85
	20/21/1 मिन	0	00	76		290 मिन	0	08	85
	20/21/2 मिन	0	01	77		308 मिन	0	08	95
	20/22 मिन	0	05	06		309 मिन	0	08	95
	22/1/2 मिन	0	04	05		313 मिन	0	11	13
	22/2 मिन	0	07	08		2340 मिन	0	04	55
	22/9 मिन	0	02	78		2341 मिन	0	00	76
	22/12 मिन	0	12	65		2343 मिन	0	10	12
	22/19/2 मिन	0	10	12		2345 मिन	0	02	53
	22/22 मिन	0	10	12		2346 मिन	0	03	79
	41/2 मिन	0	09	61		2347 मिन	0	02	53
	41/9 मिन	0	10	12		2349 मिन	0	07	59
	41/12 मिन	0	10	12		2350 मिन	0	00	76
	41/19 मिन	0	10	12		2360 मिन	0	08	85
	41/22 मिन	0	10	12		2378 मिन	0	08	85
	44/2 मिन	0	10	12		2383 मिन	0	08	85
	44/9 मिन	0	10	12		2384 मिन	0	05	06
	44/12/2 मिन	0	10	12		2385 मिन	0	03	79
	44/19 मिन	0	09	36		2388 मिन	0	08	95
	44/22 मिन	0	10	12		2389 मिन	0	00	51
	65/2/1 मिन	0	03	29		2391 मिन	0	08	85
	65/2/2 मिन	0	05	82		2504 मिन	0	08	85
	65/3 मिन	0	01	01		2505 मिन	0	06	83
	65/8 मिन	0	03	04		2511 मिन	0	00	76
	65/9 मिन	0	06	58		2518 मिन	0	08	85
	65/12 मिन	0	04	55		2520 मिन	0	08	85
	65/13 मिन	0	05	56		2521 मिन	0	08	09
	65/18 मिन	0	06	58		2524 मिन	0	02	02
	65/19 मिन	0	03	54		2576 मिन	0	00	51
	65/22 मिन	0	02	53		2577 मिन	0	08	35
	65/23/1 मिन	0	06	07		2578 मिन	0	03	04
	65/23/2 मिन	0	01	52		2579 मिन	0	05	82
	66/2 मिन	0	01	01		2582 मिन	0	09	85
	66/3 मिन	0	08	35		2585 मिन	0	08	85
	66/9 मिन	0	01	26		2588 मिन	0	08	85
	166 मिन	0	02	28		2603 मिन	0	00	51
	210 मिन	0	00	51		2794 मिन	0	00	51
	222 मिन	0	00	51		2797 मिन	0	05	82
	587 मिन	0	00	76		2798 मिन	0	03	04
	603 मिन	0	00	76		2805 मिन	0	08	35
पहलादपुर खलीला	101 मिन	0	03	04		2806 मिन	0	09	85
ह० न० 34	106 मिन	0	04	30		2812 मिन	0	08	85
	107 मिन	0	02	02		2813 मिन	0	08	35
	108 मिन	0	07	08		2814 मिन	0	00	51
	114 मिन	0	08	35		2817 मिन	0	05	82
	115 मिन	0	00	76		2818 मिन	0	03	29
	119 मिन	0	08	85		2825 मिन	0	05	56

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
बरशाम ह० नं० 35	2826 मिन	0	03	29	हरनाली	5/14 मिन	0	08	35
	2827 मिन	0	08	35	ह० नं० 36	5/17/1 मिन	0	01	52
	2834 मिन	0	04	55		5/17/2 मिन	0	08	60
	2835 मिन	0	00	51		5/24 मिन	0	10	12
दीवाना ह० नं० 33	8/22/1 मिन	0	05	31		5/26 मिन	0	02	02
	10/1 मिन	0	01	77		14/4/2 मिन	0	01	26
	10/2 मिन	0	08	09		14/14 मिन	0	02	53
	10/9 मिन	0	10	37		14/16 मिन	0	03	54
	10/12 मिन	0	09	86		14/17 मिन	0	06	58
	10/19/1 मिन	0	02	02		14/24 मिन	0	00	51
	10/19/2 मिन	0	08	35		14/25 मिन	0	09	61
	10/22 मिन	0	09	36		16/21 मिन	0	02	02
	10/23 मिन	0	01	01		17/5 मिन	0	10	12
	26/2 मिन	0	02	78		17/6 मिन	0	10	12
	26/3 मिन	0	07	84		17/15 मिन	0	10	37
	26/8 मिन	0	10	37		17/16 मिन	0	10	37
	26/13 मिन	0	08	09		17/25 मिन	0	06	32
	26/18 मिन	0	09	61		30/5 मिन	0	00	25
	26/23 मिन	0	09	86		31/1/1 मिन	0	01	52
	26/24 मिन	0	00	25		31/20 मिन	0	10	37
	26/26 मिन	0	02	02		31/21 मिन	0	06	07
	30/3 मिन	0	05	31		31/110 मिन	0	06	32
	30/4 मिन	0	05	31		31/131 मिन	0	05	56
	30/7 मिन	0	09	36	सिबाह	113/13 मिन	0	04	81
	30/14 मिन	0	10	37	ह० नं० 32	18/2 मिन	0	03	29
	30/17/1 मिन	0	00	76		113/19/1 मिन	0	07	08
	30/17/2 मिन	0	09	61		113/22/2 मिन	0	00	76
	30/24 मिन	0	10	37		113/23 मिन	0	09	61
	47/4/1 मिन	0	01	52		114/3 मिन	0	09	86
	17/4/2 मिन	0	05	56		114/8 मिन	0	09	86
	47/5 मिन	0	03	54		114/13 मिन	0	11	63
	47/6 मिन	0	09	36		114/18 मिन	0	05	56
	47/7 मिन	0	00	76		114/24 मिन	0	06	07
	47/7/2 मिन	0	00	00		146/4 मिन	0	07	33
	47/15 मिन	0	09	61		146/7 मिन	0	10	37
	47/16 मिन	0	10	37		146/15 मिन	0	04	81
	47/25 मिन	0	10	37		209 मिन	0	01	26
	50/5 मिन	0	09	61	मेहराबा	2/24 मिन	0	10	37
	50/6 मिन	0	03	04	ह० नं० 29	6/4 मिन	0	10	37
	51/1 मिन	0	00	76		5/5 मिन	0	00	25
	51/10 मिन	0	07	33		5/7 मिन	0	06	32
	51/11 मिन	0	10	37		17/2/2 मिन	0	05	31
	51/20 मिन	0	10	37		17/8 मिन	0	03	04
	51/21 मिन	0	03	04		17/9 मिन	0	07	33
	94 मिन	0	01	01		17/12 मिन	0	00	25
	117 मिन	0	00	51		17/13 मिन	0	10	12
	118 मिन	0	00	51		17/18 मिन	0	10	37
	124 मिन	0	00	51		17/23 मिन	0	10	37
	218 मिन	0	00	76		25/3 मिन	0	10	37
	224 मिन	0	00	76		25/7 मिन	0	09	36
हरनाली ह० नं० 36	4/23 मिन	0	01	26		25/14 मिन	0	02	02
	5/3/2 मिन	0	07	84		31/12 मिन	0	05	31
	5/4 मिन	0	01	77		31/19/1 मिन	0	05	31
	5/7 मिन	0	08	09		31/19/2 मिन	0	05	31
	5/8 मिन	0	02	02		31/22 मिन	0	10	62

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
महेरावा	44/2 मिन	0	06	07	पानीपत तरफ राजपुतान	827 मिन	0	00	51
ह०न० 29	44/3 मिन	0	04	05	ह०न० 16	831 मिन	0	00	00
	44/8 मिन	0	10	12		832 मिन	0	04	55
	44/9 मिन	0	00	25		836 मिन	0	00	76
	44/13/1 मिन	0	03	54		869/2/2 मिन	0	00	76
	44/13/2 मिन	0	05	06		872 मिन	0	05	57
	44/18/2 मिन	0	10	37		873/2 मिन	0	08	35
	44/23 मिन	0	10	37		874 मिन	0	10	12
	49/3 मिन	0	05	06		877 मिन	0	00	76
	49/4/1 मिन	0	02	53		878 मिन	0	04	55
	49/4/2 मिन	0	02	78		886 मिन	0	08	85
	49/7/1 मिन	0	02	28		887 मिन	0	01	77
	49/7/2 मिन	0	08	09		888 मिन	0	07	08
	49/14 मिन	0	10	37		889 मिन	0	05	06
	49/17 मिन	0	10	37		890 मिन	0	11	89
	49/24 मिन	0	08	60		891 मिन	0	01	77
	49/25 मिन	0	01	77		892 मिन	0	07	84
	62/4 मिन	0	01	01		893/1 मिन	0	00	51
	62/5 मिन	0	09	35		991 मिन	0	03	79
	62/6 मिन	0	18	36		992 मिन	0	03	79
	62/15 मिन	0	10	37		995 मिन	0	06	32
	62/16 मिन	0	09	86		996 मिन	0	08	10
	62/25/2 मिन	0	02	78		1012 मिन	0	01	26
	62/26 मिन	0	00	51		1016 मिन	0	08	35
	62/21 मिन	0	07	84		1018 मिन	0	06	32
	65/1 मिन	0	09	86		1021 मिन	0	05	57
	65/10 मिन	0	10	37		1022 मिन	0	04	05
	15/11 मिन	0	09	86		1023 मिन	0	01	77
	65/19 मिन	0	03	29		1122 मिन	0	01	26
	15/20/2 मिन	0	04	81		4155/1123/1 मिन	0	01	77
	65/21 मिन	0	00	00		4157/1125 मिन	0	00	76
	65/22 मिन	0	09	86		1136 मिन	0	07	08
	77/2/1 मिन	0	08	35		1137 मिन	0	02	53
	77/2/2 मिन	0	01	52		1149 मिन	0	02	53
	77/9 मिन	0	10	37		1151 मिन	0	11	89
	77/12 मिन	0	05	56		1156 मिन	0	15	18
	106 मिन	0	01	77		1475/2 मिन	0	00	76
	186 मिन	0	03	54		1496 मिन	0	00	51
पानीपत तरफ राजपुतान	693 मिन	0	06	83		1497/1 मिन	0	00	76
ह०न० 16	694 मिन	0	01	77		1497/2 मिन	0	01	26
	695 मिन	0	00	00		1497/3 मिन	0	06	58
	698 मिन	0	00	76		1498 मिन	0	01	77
	698/1 मिन	0	01	26		1499 मिन	0	01	26
	810 मिन	0	09	61		1500 मिन	0	00	51
	811 मिन	0	01	77		1503 मिन	0	12	65
	812 मिन	0	05	06		1504 मिन	0	13	91
	813 मिन	0	00	00		1508 मिन	0	12	65
	815 मिन	0	04	55		1519 मिन	0	01	77
	816 मिन	0	00	51		1520 मिन	0	00	00
	821 मिन	0	03	29		1524 मिन	0	07	36
	822 मिन	0	08	85		1525 मिन	0	03	79
	823 मिन	0	00	76		1528 मिन	0	01	77
	824 मिन	0	08	10		1529 मिन	0	07	08
	825 मिन	0	00	51		1532 मिन	0	01	77

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
पानीपत तराफ राजपूताना	1537 मिन	0	01	26	पानीपत तराफ राजपूताना	3965/1986 मिन	0	09	11
होन० 16	1538 मिन	0	12	65	होन० 16	1988 मिन	0	07	08
	1539 मिन	0	15	18		1989 मिन	0	03	79
	1540 मिन	0	00	76		1979 मिन	0	03	04
	1543 मिन	0	00	76		1998 मिन	0	01	77
	1545 मिन	0	06	07		1999 मिन	0	00	51
	1552 मिन	0	08	10		2011 मिन	0	07	08
	1553 मिन	0	05	06		2012 मिन	0	04	55
	1558 मिन	0	02	02		2017 मिन	0	01	77
	1560 मिन	0	02	02		2041 मिन	0	02	53
	1561 मिन	0	10	88	सोधापुर	18/11 मिन	0	02	78
	1562 मिन	0	00	76	होन० 26	19/9 मिन	0	05	31
	1563 मिन	0	03	29		19/10/2 मिन	0	01	77
	1564 मिन	0	02	02		19/12 मिन	0	10	37
	1572 मिन	0	06	32		19/19 मिन	0	10	37
	1573 मिन	0	10	63		19/22/1 मिन	0	07	33
	1574 मिन	0	02	02		19/22/2 मिन	0	03	04
	1575 मिन	0	03	04		32/2 मिन	0	10	37
	1576 मिन	0	03	71		32/8 मिन	0	03	04
	1577 मिन	0	00	51		32/9 मिन	0	07	33
	1844 मिन	0	00	51		32/12 मिन	0	01	01
	1847 मिन	0	02	02		32/13 मिन	0	09	36
	1848 मिन	0	09	36		32/18 मिन	0	10	37
	1859 मिन	0	04	55		32/23 मिन	0	09	36
	1860 मिन	0	13	66	पानीपत तराफ इन्डार	1735 मिन	0	00	00
	1861 मिन	0	00	00	होन० 12	1744 मिन	0	03	04
	1864 मिन	0	01	77		5612/1745 मिन	0	04	30
	1865 मिन	0	10	12		5613/1746 मिन	0	07	08
	1866 मिन	0	06	83		1747/1 मिन	0	10	63
	1867 मिन	0	00	00		1747/2 मिन	0	00	76
	1910 मिन	0	08	35		2346 मिन	0	00	76
	1911 मिन	0	01	26		2347 मिन	0	02	53
	1917 मिन	0	04	55		2357 मिन	0	00	51
	1918 मिन	0	05	57		2358 मिन	0	07	59
	1920 मिन	0	00	76		2360 मिन	0	10	12
	1923 मिन	0	02	02		5724/2361 मिन	0	01	26
	1924 मिन	0	05	82		2362 मिन	0	13	91
	1930 मिन	0	03	29		2363 मिन	0	07	59
	1931 मिन	0	00	51		2364 मिन	0	00	51
	1932 मिन	0	08	85		2365 मिन	0	09	11
	1933 मिन	0	01	26		2366 मिन	0	07	59
	1948 मिन	0	05	82		2368 मिन	0	00	00
	1948 मिन	0	05	57		2369 मिन	0	02	02
	1949/2 मिन	0	10	12		2370 मिन	0	07	08
	1950 मिन	0	00	51		2371 मिन	0	08	35
	1953/1 मिन	0	01	77		2372 मिन	0	10	88
	1969 मिन	0	00	51		2373 मिन	0	02	53
	1970 मिन	0	05	82		2374 मिन	0	00	51
	1971 मिन	0	00	51		2375 मिन	0	02	02
	1972 मिन	0	02	02		2376 मिन	0	01	26
	1974 मिन	0	15	43		2378 मिन	0	02	53
	1975 मिन	0	01	77		2379 मिन	0	06	57
	1976 मिन	0	03	04		2381 मिन	0	01	26
	1977 मिन	0	02	53		2382 मिन	0	04	30
	1978 मिन	0	02	53		2385 मिन	0	00	51
	1979 मिन	0	00	51					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
पानीपत ताराक इन्साफ	3087 मिन	0	07	08	काबरी	82/22 मिन	0	10	12
ह०न० 12	3088 मिन	0	11	18	ह०न० 18	89/2 मिन	0	10	12
	3094 मिन	0	00	00		89/9 मिन	0	10	12
	3095 मिन	0	08	10		89/12 मिन	0	10	12
	3096 मिन	0	10	12		89/18 मिन	0	09	36
	3097 मिन	0	00	00		89/22 मिन	0	05	82
	3101 मिन	0	09	61		96/26 मिन	0	11	89
	3102 मिन	0	15	18		116 मिन	0	01	52
	3104 मिन	0	01	77		149 मिन	0	00	51
	3107 मिन	0	10	88		154 मिन	0	00	51
	3109 मिन	0	00	51		163 मिन	0	00	76
	3110 मिन	0	02	53		164 मिन	0	00	51
	3111/2 मिन	0	03	85		726 मिन	0	00	76
	3146 मिन	0	01	77		731 मिन	0	00	76
सिकन्दरपुर	29/22 मिन	0	08	35		732 मिन	0	00	76
ह०न० 19	44/2 मिन	0	03	54	रतिपुर	736 मिन	0	00	76
	44/9 मिन	0	01	01	ह०न० 16	12/9 मिन	0	07	33
	58/9 मिन	0	06	17		12/12 मिन	0	10	12
	68/12 मिन	0	10	12		12/19 मिन	0	10	12
	58/19 मिन	0	07	54		12/22 मिन	0	09	61
	58/20 मिन	0	02	53		21/2 मिन	0	10	12
	58/21 मिन	0	05	06		21/9 मिन	0	10	12
	58/22/1 मिन	0	04	05		21/12 मिन	0	10	12
	59/1 मिन	0	09	61		21/19 मिन	0	10	12
	59/2 मिन	0	00	51		21/22 मिन	0	10	12
	59/10 मिन	0	08	85		29/2 मिन	0	10	12
	59/299 मिन	0	00	76		29/9 मिन	0	10	12
काबरी	26/12 मिन	0	02	02		29/12/1 मिन	0	09	36
ह०न० 18	26/19 मिन	0	10	12		29/19 मिन	0	10	12
	26/22 मिन	0	10	12		29/22 मिन	0	09	11
	29/2 मिन	0	10	12		29/26 मिन	0	00	76
	29/9 मिन	0	10	12		37/2 मिन	0	10	12
	29/12 मिन	0	09	39		37/9 मिन	0	10	12
	29/19 मिन	0	10	12		37/12 मिन	0	07	59
	29/22 मिन	0	10	12		42/2 मिन	0	01	01
	42/2/1 मिन	0	09	61		48 मिन	0	00	51
	42/9 मिन	0	09	36	मुहम्मदपुर	18/1 मिन	0	05	56
	42/12 मिन	0	10	12	ह०न० 15	18/10 मिन	0	10	12
	42/19 मिन	0	10	12		18/11 मिन	0	10	12
	42/22 मिन	0	10	12		18/20 मिन	0	10	12
	57/2 मिन	0	09	61		18/21 मिन	0	10	12
	57/9/2 मिन	0	10	12		23/1 मिन	0	10	12
	57/12 मिन	0	09	36		23/10 मिन	0	10	12
	57/19 मिन	0	10	12		23/11 मिन	0	10	12
	57/22 मिन	0	08	60		23/20 मिन	0	04	05
	68/2 मिन	0	09	61		50 मिन	0	01	52
	68/9 मिन	0	10	12		609 मिन	0	08	09
	68/12/1 मिन	0	02	53		610 मिन	0	07	84
	68/12/2 मिन	0	07	59		612/1 मिन	0	08	85
	68/19 मिन	0	08	09		612/2 मिन	0	00	51
	68/22 मिन	0	03	54		954/619 मिन	0	03	04
	82/2 मिन	0	06	58		620 मिन	0	05	06
	82/9 मिन	0	09	11		621 मिन	0	00	51
	82/12 मिन	0	10	12		622 मिन	0	08	85
	82/19 मिन	0	10	12		625 मिन	0	01	52
		0	10	12		626 मिन	0	03	04

1	2	3	4	5
मुहम्मदपुर	627/2 मिन	0	08	35
हॉन० 15	629 मिन	0	01	77
	630 मिन	0	01	52
	631 मिन	0	01	77
	668 मिन	0	01	52
	671/2 मिन	0	03	01
कछरोली	3/20 मिन	0	01	01
हॉन० 1	3/21 मिन	0	10	12
	11/1 मिन	0	10	12
	11/10 मिन	0	10	12
	11/11 मिन	0	10	12
	11/20 मिन	0	10	12
	11/21/1 मिन	0	00	76
	11/21/2 मिन	0	07	84
	रास्ता बिना खमरा न०	0	10	77
	13/1 मिन	0	10	12
	13/10 मिन	0	10	12
	13/11 मिन	0	10	12
	13/20 मिन	0	10	12
	13/21 मिन	0	10	12
	24/1 मिन	0	10	12
	24/10 मिन	0	10	12
	24/11 मिन	0	10	12
	24/20 मिन	0	10	12
	24/21 मिन	0	10	12
	35/1 मिन	0	10	12
	35/10 मिन	0	10	12
	35/11 मिन	0	10	12
	35/20 मिन	0	10	12
	35/21 मिन	0	10	12
	41/1 मिन	0	04	55

[स. 12020/19/80-प्रौ०]

फिरन चण्डा, ग्राम सचिव

S. O. 57.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum products from Mathura in Uttar Pradesh to Jullundur in Punjab pipelines should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And Whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto ;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;

Provided That any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Mathura-Jullundur Pipeline New House, Kunjpura Road, Karnal (Haryana).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Tahsil : Panipat	District : Karnal	State : Haryana			
Name of Village	Khasra No.	Area	H.	A.	Sq. M
1	2	3	4	5	6
Chullkana H. No. 118	16/19 Min	0	12	39	
	16/22 Min	0	10	12	
	42/2 Min	0	10	12	
	42/9 Min	0	09	61	
	42/12 Min	0	10	12	
	42/19 Min	0	10	12	
	42/22 Min	0	10	12	
	48/2 Min	0	10	12	
	48/9 Min	0	10	12	
	48/12 Min	0	10	12	
	48/19/2 Min	0	10	12	
	48/21/2 Min	0	00	25	
	48/22 Min	0	09	36	
	75/1/1/2 Min	0	00	51	
	75/1/2 Min	0	01	01	
	75/2/1 Min	0	02	53	
	75/2/2 Min	0	04	05	
	75/9 Min	0	06	58	
	75/10 Min	0	02	78	
	75/11 Min	0	05	56	
	75/12 Min	0	04	55	
	75/19 Min	0	02	28	
	75/20/1 Min	0	07	08	
	75/21/2 Min	0	10	12	
	84/1 Min	0	10	12	
	84/10/1 Min	0	10	12	
	84/11 Min	0	10	12	
	84/20/1 Min	0	02	02	
Chullkana H. No. 118	84/21 Min	0	02	02	
	111/1 Min	0	10	12	
	111/10/2 Min	0	10	12	
	111/11 Min	0	10	12	
	111/20 Min	0	10	12	
	111/21 Min	0	10	12	
	113/5 Min	0	00	25	
	113/6 Min	0	01	52	
	114/1 Min	0	09	61	
	114/10 Min	0	07	33	
	195 Min	0	02	02	
	223 Min	0	00	51	
	224 Min	0	00	51	
	225 Min	0	00	51	
	260 Min	0	00	76	
	329 Min	0	00	51	
Namouda H. No. 79	51/4 Min	0	05	06	
	51/7/1 Min	0	08	09	
	51/7/2 Min	0	02	02	
	51/14 Min	0	10	12	
	51/17/1 Min	0	06	07	
	51/17/2 Min	0	04	05	
	51/24/1 Min	0	10	12	
	70/4/1 Min	0	00	51	
	70/4/2 Min	0	08	60	
	70/7/1 Min	0	02	53	
	70/7/2 Min	0	07	08	
	70/8 Min	0	00	51	
	70/13/3 Min	0	02	53	
	70/14 Min	0	04	30	
	70/17 Min	0	06	07	

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Namonda H. No. 79	70/18/1 Min	0	04	05	Dhodpur H. No. 75	23/21 Min	0	03	04
	70/23 Min	0	05	31		23/22 Min	0	07	08
	70/24/1 Min	0	04	30		25/1 Min	0	05	56
	74/3/2 Min	0	09	11		25/2 Min	0	04	55
	74/4/1 Min	0	01	01		25/9 Min	0	01	52
	74/8 Min	0	10	12		25/10/1 Min	0	06	07
	74/13 Min	0	09	36		25/10/2 Min	0	02	53
	74/18 Min	0	10	12		25/11/1 Min	0	00	76
	74/23 Min	0	10	12		25/11/2 Min	0	05	06
	91/3 Min	0	10	12		25/11/3 Min	0	03	79
	91/8 Min	0	10	12		25/12 Min	0	00	25
	91/13 Min	0	10	12		25/20 Min	0	09	36
	91/18/1 Min	0	04	30		25/21 Min	0	10	12
	91/18/2 Min	0	05	82		42/1 Min	0	09	61
	91/22/3 Min	0	00	25		42/10 Min	0	07	84
	91/23 Min	0	09	61		42/11 Min	0	10	12
	94/2/1 Min	0	01	26		42/20 Min	0	10	12
	94/2/2 Min	0	00	25		42/21 Min	0	10	12
	94/3/1 Min	0	06	32		46/1 Min	0	09	61
	94/8 Min	0	05	06		46/10 Min	0	10	12
	94/9 Min	0	05	06		46/11 Min	0	10	12
	94/12 Min	0	06	32		46/20 Min	0	08	09
	94/13 Min	0	00	76		46/21 Min	0	05	06
	123 Min	0	03	04		47/16 Min	0	01	01
	143 Min	0	00	51		47/25 Min	0	03	04
	290 Min	0	00	76		56/5 Min	0	04	55
	291 Min	0	00	76		56/6 Min	0	07	08
	292 Min	0	01	77		56/15 Min	0	09	11
	293 Min	0	01	52		56/16 Min	0	12	65
	295 Min	0	00	76		56/25 Min	0	05	31
	332 Min	0	00	25	Dhodpur H. No. 75	57/1 Min	0	02	78
Kiwana H. No. 78	19/25 Min	0	01	77		57/10 Min	0	01	01
	20/5 Min	0	10	12		59/5 Min	0	10	12
	20/6 Min	0	09	36		59/6 Min	0	10	12
	20/15/1 Min	0	10	12		59/15 Min	7	10	12
	20/16 Min	0	09	61		59/16/1 Min	0	10	12
	20/24/3 Min	0	00	25		59/25/1 Min	0	05	82
	20/25 Min	0	09	61		59/25/2 Min	0	02	02
	39/4 Min	0	02	02		77 Min	0	02	28
	39/5 Min	0	08	09		78 Min	0	02	28
	39/6 Min	0	05	06		108 Min	0	00	51
	39/7 Min	0	04	55		109 Min	0	06	58
	39/14 Min	0	08	09		254 Min	0	00	76
	39/15 Min	0	02	02		269 Min	0	00	76
	39/16 Min	0	00	00	Manana H. No. 76	41/3/1 Min	0	01	01
	39/17/1 Min	0	01	01		41/8 Min	0	08	60
	39/17/2 Min	0	09	11		41/13 Min	0	10	12
	39/24 Min	0	09	36		41/18 Min	0	10	12
	41/4 Min	0	09	61		41/23 Min	0	10	12
	41/7/1 Min	0	03	54		42/3 Min	0	10	12
	41/7/2 Min	0	06	58		42/8 Min	0	10	12
	41/14 Min	0	04	30		42/13/1 Min	0	07	08
	41/17 Min	0	12	39		42/13/2 Min	0	03	04
	41/24/1 Min	0	10	12		42/18 Min	0	10	12
	64/4/1 Min	0	05	06		42/23 Min	0	10	12
	119 Min	0	03	29		62/3/2 Min	0	10	12
	267 Min	0	00	51		62/8 Min	0	10	12
	268 Min	0	00	51		62/13 Min	0	09	11
	269 Min	0	00	51		62/18 Min	0	08	60
	669 Min	0	00	76		62/23 Min	0	10	12
	671 Min	0	01	52	Manana H.No. 76	63/3 Min	0	10	12
Dhodpur H. No. 75	23/10 Min	0	04	81		63/8 Min	0	10	12
	23/12 Min	0	10	12		63/13 Min	0	10	12
	23/17 Min	0	09	11		63/18 Min	0	10	12
	23/20 Min	0	00	76		63/23 Min	0	10	12

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Manana H. No. 76	87/3 Min	0	10	12	Naraina H. No. 74	65/12 Min	0	04	55
	87/8/2 Min	0	09	36		65/13 Min	0	05	56
	87/12/2 Min	0	00	25		65/18 Min	0	06	58
	87/13 Min	0	09	61		65/19 Min	0	03	54
	87/18 Min	0	07	08		65/22 Min	0	02	53
	87/19/1 Min	0	03	04		65/23/1 Min	0	06	07
	87/22 Min	0	04	81		65/23/2 Min	0	01	52
	87/23 Min	0	04	81		66/2 Min	0	01	01
	90/2/2 Min	0	07	59		66/3 Min	0	08	35
	90/23 Min	0	04	81		66/9 Min	0	01	26
	90/2/2 Min	0	07	50		166 Min	0	02	28
	90/3 Min	0	02	53		210 Min	0	00	51
	90/8/2 Min	0	00	51		222 Min	0	00	51
	90/9/1 Min	0	08	09		587 Min	0	00	76
	90/9/2 Min	0	02	02		603 Min	0	00	76
	90/12 Min	0	10	12	Pahladpur Khahla H. No. 34	101 Min	0	03	04
	90/19 Min	0	10	12		106 Min	0	04	30
	90/22 Min	0	10	12		107 Min	0	02	02
	114/2 Min	0	09	36		108 Min	0	07	08
	114/9 Min	0	10	12		114 Min	0	08	35
	114/12/1 Min	0	08	09		115 Min	0	00	76
	114/12/2 Min	0	02	02		119 Min	0	08	85
	114/19 Min	0	10	12		124 Min	0	08	85
	114/22/1 Min	0	00	76		131 Min	0	10	12
	114/22/2 Min	0	09	11		227 Min	0	01	26
	117/2 Min	0	10	12		230 Min	0	06	32
	117/9 Min	0	05	31		231 Min	0	08	85
	175 Min	0	02	53		272 Min	0	08	85
	264 Min	0	00	51		273 Min	0	08	85
	702 Min	0	00	76		282 Min	0	08	85
	703 Min	0	00	76		283 Min	0	08	85
						290 Min	0	08	85
						308 Min	0	08	85
						309 Min	0	08	85
						313 Min	0	11	13
Naraina H. No. 74	20/10 Min	0	04	55	Bursham H. No. 35	2340 Min	0	04	55
	20/11 Min	0	09	61		3241 Min	0	00	76
	20/12 Min	0	00	51		2343 Min	0	10	12
	20/19/2 Min	0	02	02		2345 Min	0	02	53
	20/20 Min	0	07	59		2346 Min	0	03	79
	20/21/1 Min	0	00	76		2347 Min	0	02	53
	20/21/2 Min	0	01	77		2349 Min	0	07	59
	20/22 Min	0	05	06		2350 Min	0	00	76
	22/1/2 Min	0	04	05		2360 Min	0	08	85
	22/2 Min	0	07	08		2378 Min	0	08	85
	22/1/2 Min	0	04	05		2383 Min	0	08	85
	22/2 Min	0	07	08		2384 Min	0	05	06
	22/9 Min	0	02	78		2385 Min	0	03	79
	22/12 Min	0	12	65		2388 Min	0	08	85
	22/19/2 Min	0	10	12		2389 Min	0	00	51
	22/22 Min	0	10	12		2391 Min	0	08	85
	41/2 Min	0	09	61		2504 Min	0	08	85
	41/9 Min	0	10	12		2505 Min	0	06	83
	41/12 Min	0	10	12		2511 Min	0	00	76
	41/19 Min	0	10	12		2518 Min	0	08	85
	41/22 Min	0	10	12		2520 Min	0	08	85
	44/2 Min	0	10	12		2521 Min	0	08	09
	44/9 Min	0	10	12		2524 Min	0	02	02
	44/12/2 Min	0	10	12		2576 Min	0	00	51
	44/19 Min	0	09	36		2577 Min	0	08	35
	44/22 Min	0	10	12		2578 Min	0	03	04
	65/2/1 Min	0	03	29		2579 Min	0	05	82
	65/2/2 Min	0	05	82		2582 Min	0	08	85
	65/3 Min	0	01	01		2585 Min	0	08	85
	65/8 Min	0	03	04		2588 Min	0	08	85
	65/9 Min	0	06	58					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Bursham H. No. 35 —contd.	2603 Min	0	00	51	Hartali H. No. 36	5/7 Min	0	08	09
	2794 Min	0	00	51		5/8 Min	0	02	02
	2797 Min	0	05	82		5/14 Min	0	08	35
	2798 Min	0	03	04		5/17/1 Min	0	01	52
	2805 Min	0	08	35		5/17/2 Min	0	08	60
	2806 Min	0	08	85		5/24 Min	0	10	12
	2812 Min	0	08	85		5/26 Min	0	02	02
	2813 Min	0	08	35		14/4/2 Min	0	01	26
	2814 Min	0	00	51		14/14 Min	0	02	53
	2817 Min	0	05	82		14/16 Min	0	03	54
	2818 Min	0	03	29		14/17 Min	0	06	58
	2825 Min	0	05	56		14/24 Min	0	00	51
	2826 Min	0	03	29		14/25 Min	0	09	61
	2827 Min	0	08	35		16/21 Min	0	02	02
	2834 Min	0	04	55		17/5 Min	0	10	12
	2835 Min	0	00	51		17/6 Min	0	10	12
Diwana H. No. 33	8/22/1 Min	0	05	31		17/15 Min	0	10	37
	10/1 Min	0	01	77		17/16 Min	0	10	37
	10/2 Min	0	08	09		17/25 Min	0	06	32
	10/9 Min	0	10	37		30/5 Min	0	00	25
	10/12 Min	0	09	86		31/1/1 Min	0	01	52
	10/19/1 Min	0	02	02		31/20 Min	0	10	37
	10/19/2 Min	0	08	35		31/21 Min	0	06	07
	10/22 Min	0	09	36		31/110 Min	0	06	32
	10/23 Min	0	01	01		31/131 Min	0	05	56
	26/2 Min	0	02	78	Siwah H. No. 32	113/13 Min	0	04	81
	26/3 Min	0	07	84		113/18/2 Min	0	03	29
	26/8 Min	0	10	37		113/19/1 Min	0	07	08
	26/13 Min	0	08	09		113/22/2 Min	0	00	76
	26/18 Min	0	09	61		113/23 Min	0	09	61
	26/23 Min	0	09	86		114/3 Min	0	09	86
	26/24 Min	0	00	25		114/8 Min	0	09	86
	26/26 Min	0	02	02		114/13 Min	0	11	63
	30/3 Min	0	05	31		114/18 Min	0	05	56
	30/4 Min	0	05	31		114/24 Min	0	06	07
	30/7 Min	0	09	36		146/4 Min	0	07	33
	30/14 Min	0	10	37		146/7 Min	0	10	37
	30/17/1 Min	0	00	76		146/15 Min	0	04	81
	30/17/2 Min	0	09	61		146/209 Min	0	01	26
	30/24 Min	0	10	37	Mahrana H. No. 29	2/24 Min	0	10	37
	47/4/1 Min	0	01	52		6/4 Min	0	10	37
	47/4/2 Min	0	05	56		6/5 Min	0	00	25
	47/5 Min	0	03	54		6/7 Min	0	06	32
	47/6 Min	0	09	36		17/2/2 Min	0	05	31
	47/7/1 Min	0	00	76		17/8 Min	0	03	04
	47/7/2 Min	0	00	00		17/9 Min	0	07	33
	47/15 Min	0	09	61		17/12 Min	0	00	25
	47/16 Min	0	10	37		17/13 Min	0	10	12
	47/25 Min	0	10	37		17/18 Min	0	10	37
	50/5 Min	0	09	61		17/23 Min	0	10	37
	50/6 Min	0	03	04		25/3 Min	0	10	37
	51/1 Min	0	00	76		25/7 Min	0	09	36
	51/10 Min	0	07	33		24/14 Min	0	02	02
	51/11 Min	0	10	37		31/12 Min	0	05	31
	51/20 Min	0	10	37		31/19/1 Min	0	05	31
	51/21 Min	0	03	04		31/19/2 Min	0	05	31
	94 Min	0	01	01		31/22 Min	0	10	62
	117 Min	0	00	51		44/2 Min	0	06	07
	118 Min	0	00	51		44/3*Min	0	04	05
	124 Min	0	00	51		44/8 Min	0	10	12
	218 Min	0	00	76		44/9 Min	0	00	25
	224 Min	0	00	76		44/13/1 Min	0	03	54
Hartali H. No. 36	4/23 Min	0	01	26		44/13/2 Min	0	05	06
	5/3/2 Min	0	07	84		44/18/2 Min	0	10	37
	5/4 Min	0	01	77					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mahrana II. No. 29	44/23 Min	0	10	37	Panipat Taraf Rajputan H. No. 16	892 Min	0	07	84
	49/3 Min	0	05	06		893/1 Min	0	00	51
	49/4/1 Min	0	02	53		991 Min	0	03	79
	49/4/2 Min	0	02	78		992 Min	0	03	79
	49/7/1 Min	0	02	28		995 Min	0	06	32
	49/7/2 Min	0	08	09		996 Min	0	08	10
	49/14 Min	0	10	37		1012 Min	0	01	26
	49/17 Min	0	10	37		1016 Min	0	08	35
	49/24 Min	0	03	60		1018 Min	0	06	32
	49/25 Min	0	01	77		1021 Min	0	05	57
	62/4 Min	0	01	01		1022 Min	0	04	05
	62/5 Min	0	09	36		1023 Min	0	01	77
	62/6 Min	0	10	37		1122 Min	0	01	26
	62/15 Min	0	10	37		4155/1123/1 Min	0	01	77
	62/16 Min	0	09	86		4157/1125 Min	0	00	76
	62/25/2 Min	0	02	78		1136 Min	0	07	08
	63/20 Min	0	00	51		1137 Min	0	02	53
	63/21 Min	0	07	84		1149 Min	0	02	53
	65/1 Min	0	09	86		1151 Min	0	11	89
	65/10 Min	0	10	37		1156 Min	0	15	18
	65/11 Min	0	09	86		1475/2 Min	0	00	76
	65/19 Min	0	03	29		1496 Min	0	00	51
	65/20/2 Min	0	04	81		1497/1 Min	0	00	76
	65/21 Min	0	00	00		1497/2 Min	0	01	26
	65/22 Min	0	09	86		1497/3 Min	0	06	58
	77/2/1 Min	0	08	35		1498 Min	0	01	77
	77/2/2 Min	0	01	52		1499 Min	0	01	26
	77/9 Min	0	10	37		1500 Min	0	00	51
	77/12 Min	0	05	56		1503 Min	0	12	65
	106 Min	0	01	77		1504 Min	0	13	91
	186 Min	0	03	54		1508 Min	0	12	65
Panipat Taraf Rajputan H. No. 16	693 Min	0	06	83		1519 Min	0	01	77
	694 Min	0	01	77		1520 Min	0	00	00
	695 Min	0	00	00		1524 Min	0	07	36
	698 Min	0	00	76		1525 Min	0	03	79
	698/1 Min	0	01	26		1528 Min	0	01	77
	810 Min	0	09	61		1529 Min	0	07	08
	811 Min	0	01	77		1532 Min	0	01	77
	812 Min	0	05	06		1537 Min	0	01	26
	813 Min	0	06	00		1538 Min	0	12	65
	815 Min	0	04	55		1539 Min	0	15	18
	816 Min	0	00	51		1540 Min	0	00	76
	821 Min	0	03	29		1543 Min	0	00	76
	822 Min	0	08	85		1545 Min	0	06	07
	823 Min	0	00	76		1552 Min	0	08	10
	824 Min	0	08	10		1553 Min	0	05	06
	825 Min	0	00	51		1558 Min	0	02	02
	827 Min	0	00	51		1560 Min	0	02	02
	831 Min	0	00	00		1561 Min	0	10	88
	832 Min	0	04	55		1562 Min	0	00	76
	836 Min	0	00	76		1563 Min	0	03	29
	869/2/2 Min	0	00	76		1564 Min	0	02	02
	872 Min	0	05	57		1572 Min	0	06	32
	873/2 Min	0	08	35		1573 Min	0	10	63
	874 Min	0	10	12		1574 Min	0	02	02
	877 Min	0	00	76		1575 Min	0	03	04
	878 Min	0	04	55		1576 Min	0	03	79
	886 Min	0	08	85		1577 Min	0	00	51
	887 Min	0	01	77		1844 Min	0	00	51
	888 Min	0	07	08		1847 Min	0	02	02
	889 Min	0	05	06		1848 Min	0	09	36
	890 Min	0	11	89		1859 Min	0	04	55
	891 Min	0	01	77		1860 Min	0	13	66

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Panipat Taraf Rajputan H. No. 16—Contd.					Panipat Taraf Insar H. No. 12				
	1861 Min	0	00	00		2346 Min	0	00	76
	1864 Min	0	01	77		2347 Min	0	02	53
	1865 Min	0	10	12		2357 Min	0	00	51
	1866 Min	0	06	83		2358 Min	0	07	59
	1867 Min	0	00	00		2360 Min	0	10	12
	1910 Min	0	08	35		5724/2361 Min	0	01	26
	1911 Min	0	01	26		2362 Min	0	13	91
	1917 Min	0	04	55		2363 Min	0	07	59
	1918 Min	0	05	57		2364 Min	0	00	51
	1920 Min	0	00	76		2365 Min	0	09	11
	1923 Min	0	02	02		2366 Min	0	07	59
	1924 Min	0	05	82		2368 Min	0	00	00
	1930 Min	0	03	29		2369 Min	0	02	02
	1931 Min	0	00	51		2370 Min	0	07	08
	1932 Min	0	08	85		2371 Min	0	08	35
	1933 Min	0	01	26		2372 Min	0	10	88
	1947 Min	0	05	82		2373 Min	0	02	53
	1948 Min	0	05	57		2374 Min	0	00	51
	1949/2 Min	0	10	12		2375 Min	0	02	02
	1950 Min	0	00	51		2376 Min	0	01	26
	1953/1 Min	0	01	77		2378 Min	0	02	53
	1969 Min	0	00	51		2379 Min	0	05	57
	1970 Min	0	05	82		2381 Min	0	01	26
	1971 Min	0	00	51		2382 Min	0	04	30
	1972 Min	0	02	02		2385 Min	0	00	51
	1974 Min	0	15	43		3087 Min	0	07	08
	1975 Min	0	01	77		3088 Min	0	11	38
	1976 Min	0	03	04		3094 Min	0	00	00
	1977 Min	0	02	53		3095 Min	0	08	10
	1978 Min	0	02	53		3096 Min	0	10	12
	1979 Min	0	00	51		3097 Min	0	00	00
	3965/1986 Min	0	09	11		3101 Min	0	07	61
	1988 Min	0	07	08		3102 Min	0	15	18
	1989 Min	0	03	79		3104 Min	0	01	77
	1997 Min	0	03	04		3107 Min	0	10	88
	1998 Min	0	01	77		3109 Min	0	00	51
	1999 Min	0	00	51		3110 Min	0	02	53
	2011 Min	0	07	08		3111/2 Min	0	08	85
	2012 Min	0	04	55		3146 Min	0	01	77
	2017 Min	0	01	77					
	2041 Min	0	02	53					
Sondhapur H. No. 26					Sikandarpur H. No. 19				
	18/11 Min	0	02	78		29/22 Min	0	08	35
	19/9 Min	0	05	31		44/2 Min	0	03	54
	19/10/2 Min	0	01	77		44/9 Min	0	01	01
	19/12 Min	0	10	37		58/9 Min	0	06	07
	19/19 Min	0	10	37		58/12 Min	0	10	12
	19/22/1 Min	0	07	33		58/19 Min	0	07	59
	19/22/2 Min	0	03	04		58/20 Min	0	02	53
	32/2 Min	0	10	37		58/21 Min	0	05	06
	32/8 Min	0	03	04		58/22/1 Min	0	04	05
	32/9 Min	0	07	33		59/1 Min	0	09	61
	32/12 Min	0	01	01		59/2 Min	0	00	51
	32/13 Min	0	09	36		59/10 Min	0	08	85
	32/18 Min	0	10	37		299 Min	0	00	76
	32/23 Min	0	09	36					
Panipat Taraf Insar H. No. 12					Kabri H. No. 18				
	1735 Min	0	00	00		26/12 Min	0	02	02
	1744 Min	0	03	04		26/19 Min	0	10	12
	5612/1745 Min	0	04	30		26/22 Min	0	10	12
	5613/1746 Min	0	07	08		29/2 Min	0	10	12
	1747/1 Min	0	10	63		29/9 Min	0	10	12
	1747/2 Min	0	00	76		29/12 Min	0	09	36
						29/19 Min	0	10	12
						29/22 Min	0	10	12
						42/2/1 Min	0	09	16
						42/9 Min	0	09	36

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Kabli H. No. 18	42/12 Min	0	10	12		609 Min	0	08	09
	42/19 Min	0	10	12		610 Min	0	07	84
	42/22 Min	0	10	12		612/1 Min	0	08	85
	57/2 Min	0	09	61		612/2 Min	0	00	51
	57/9/2 Min	0	10	12		954/619 Min	0	03	04
	57/12 Min	0	09	36		620 Min	0	05	06
	57/19 Min	0	10	12		621 Min	0	00	51
	57/22 Min	0	08	60		622 Min	0	08	85
	68/2 Min	0	09	61		625 Min	0	01	52
	68/9 Min	0	10	12		626 Min	0	03	04
	68/12/1 Min	0	02	53		627 /2 Min	0	08	35
	68/12/2 Min	0	07	59		629 Min	0	01	77
	68/19 Min	0	08	09		630 Min	0	01	52
	68/22 Min	0	03	54		631 Min	0	01	77
	82/2 Min	0	06	58		668 Min	0	01	52
	82/9 Min	0	09	11		671/2 Min	0	03	04
	82/12 Min	0	10	12	Kachhorli H. No. 1	3/20 Min	0	01	01
	82/19 Min	0	10	12		21 Min	0	10	12
	82/22 Min	0	10	12		11/1 Min	0	10	12
	89/2 Min	0	10	12		11/10 Min	0	10	12
	89/9 Min	0	10	12		11/11 Min	0	10	12
	89/12 Min	0	10	12		11/20 Min	0	10	12
	89/19 Min	0	09	36		11/21/1 Min	0	00	76
	89/22 Min	0	05	82		11/21/2 Min	0	07	84
	96/26 Min	0	11	89	Rasta Without Khasra No.				
	116 Min	0	01	52		13/1 Min	0	10	12
	149 Min	0	00	51		13/10 Min	0	10	12
	154 Min	0	00	51		13/11 Min	0	10	12
	163 Min	0	00	76		13/20 Min	0	10	12
	164 Min	0	00	51		13/21 Min	0	10	12
	726 Min	0	00	76		24/1 Min	0	10	12
	731 Min	0	00	76		24/10Min	0	10	12
	732 Min	0	00	76		24/11 Min	0	10	12
	736 Min	0	00			24/20 Min	0	10	12
						24/21 Min	0	10	12
Ratipur H. No. 16	12/9 Min	0	07	33		35/1 Min	0	10	12
	12/12 Min	0	10	12		35/10 Min	0	10	12
	12/19 Min	0	10	12		35/11 Min	0	10	12
	12/22 Min	0	09	61		35/20 Min	0	10	12
	21/2 Min	0	10	12		35/21 Min	0	10	12
	21/9 Min	0	10	12		41/1 Min	0	04	55
	21/12 Min	0	10	12					
	21/19 Min	0	10	12					
	21/22 Min	0	10	12					
	29/2 Min	0	10	12					
	29/9 Min	0	10	12					
	29/12/1 Min	0	09	36					
	29/19 Min	0	10	12					
	29/22 Min	0	09	11					
	29/26 Min	0	00	76					
	37/2 Min	0	10	12					
	37/9 Min	0	10	12					
	37/12 Min	0	07	59					
	42/2 Min	0	01	01					
	48/ Min	0	00	51					
Mahmadpur H. No. 15	18/1 Min	0	05	56					
	18/10 Min	0	10	12					
	18/11 Min	0	10	12					
	18/20 Min	0	10	12					
	18/21 Min	0	10	12					
	23/1 Min	0	10	12					
	23/10 Min	0	10	12					
	23/11 Min	0	10	12					
	23/20 Min	0	04	05					
	50 Min	0	01	52					

[No. 12020/19/80-Prod]

KIRAN CHADHA, Under Secy.

ऊर्जा मंत्रालय

(कोयला विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 16 दिसम्बर, 1980

का०अ० 58. — कोयला खान (राष्ट्रीयकरण) अधिनियम, 1973 (1973 का 26) की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने द्वारा, केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा श्री जी०एम० चक्रवर्ती को 17-4-1980 (पूर्वाह्न) से लेखा अधिकारी के पद पर पुनः नियुक्त करती है।

[फा०सं० 11023(3)/80-सी ए]

टी०सी०ए० श्रीनिवासन, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF ENERGY

(Department of Coal)

New Delhi, the 16th December, 1980

S.O. 58.—In exercise of the powers conferred under Sub-section (2) of the Section 17 of the Coal Mines

(Nationalisation) Act, 1973 (26 of 1973), the Central Government hereby re-appoints Shri S. G. Chakraborty as Accounts Officer with effect from 17-4-1980 (F.N.).

[F. No. 11023(3)/80-CA]
T. C. A. SRINIVASAN, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 18 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० आ० 59—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला खान भविष्य निधि और प्रकाण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 46) की धारा 3-ग की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 3745, तारीख 26 अक्टूबर, 1979 को अधिष्ठातृ करने हुए, 9 दिसम्बर, 1980 (अपराह्न) में कोयला खान भविष्य निधि आयुक्त के रूप में श्री डी० पान्डा की नियुक्ति अधिसूचित करती है।

[स० ए० 12012/6/78-प्रशा० (पी० एफ०) (i)]

New Delhi, the 18th December, 1980

S.O. 59.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3C of the Coal Mines Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1948 (46 of 1948), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 3745, dated the 26th October, 1979, the Central Government hereby notifies the appointment of Shri D. Panda, as the Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner with effect from the 9th day of December, 1980 (afternoon).

[No. A. 12012(6)/78-Adm I(PF)(i)]

का० आ० 60—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला खान भविष्य निधि और प्रकाण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 46) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (2) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 3091, दिनांक 29 अगस्त, 1979 को अधिष्ठातृ करने हुए, श्री डी० पान्डा, कोयला खान भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, धनबाद को 9 दिसम्बर, 1980 (अपराह्न) से उक्त उपधारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए प्राधिकारी के रूप में विनिश्चित करती है।

[[स० ए० 12012/6/78-प्रशा० (पी० एफ०) (ii)]

ए० एस० देशपांडे, उप सचिव

S.O. 60.—In pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 9 of the Coal Mines Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1948 (46 of 1948) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 3091, dated the 29th August, 1979, the Central Government hereby specifies, with effect from the 9th December, 1980 (afternoon), Shri D. Panda, Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner, Dhanbad, as the authority for the purposes of said sub-section.

[No. A. 12012(6)/78-Adm. I (PF)(ii)]
A. S. DESHPANDE, Dy. Secy

कृषि मंत्रालय

(कृषि अनुसंधान और शिक्षा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 2 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० आ० 61—भारतीय कृषि अनुसंधान परिषद् द्वारा बनायी गयी स्थायी विज्ञान समिति की नियमावली के विनियम 2 (iv) के अनुसरण में तथा ए० पी० उपकर अधिनियम, 1940 के प्रावधान की धारा 7(2) में निहित व्यवस्था के अनुसरण में, भारतीय कृषि अनुसंधान परिषद् के शासी निकाय द्वारा निकाय के निम्नलिखित सदस्यों को उनके सामने दी गई

अवधि के लिए उन्हें परिषद् की स्थायी विज्ञान समिति का सदस्य चुन लिया गया है —

नाम	अवधि
1. श्री चन्द्र शेखर सिंह, लोक सभा सदस्य, पी० आ० बांका, जिला भागलपुर, बिहार	दिनांक 30-9-1980 से एक वर्ष के लिए अथवा उसके बाद जब तक उनके उत्तराधिकारियों का विधिवत निर्वाचन न हो, इनमें से जो भी वाद में हो तब तक के लिए।
2. प्रो० एन० जी० रंगा, लोक सभा सदस्य, निडुडोलु, पोंडुर (आ० प्र०)	
3. श्री सुजान सिंह, राज्य सभा सदस्य, सुजान सिंह पार्क, सोनेपत	दिनांक 30-9-1980 से एक वर्ष के लिए अथवा उस समय तक के लिए जब तक वे शासी निकाय के सदस्य बने रहें, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो।
4. कर्तव्य अचर सिंह, गाँव तथा डाकखाना सोहल, जिला अमृतसर	
5. डा० ईश्वरभाई पटेल, उप-कुलपति गुजरात कृषि विश्वविद्यालय, ग्रहमदा-बाद	
डा० पी० एन० भादुड़ी, पी०-1/142, कल्याणी (पश्चिमी बंगाल)	
7. डा० दरोगा सिंह, निदेशक, भारतीय कृषि साक्ष्यिकी अनुसंधान संस्थान, नई दिल्ली	

[स० 2(1)/79-सी० डी० एन० 1]

क० एन० छाबड़ा, प्रवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

(Department of Agricultural Research & Education)

New Delhi, the 12th December, 1980

S.O. 61.—In pursuance of Regulation 2(iv) of the Standing Finance Committee Regulations framed by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research and in pursuance of provision contained in Section 7(2) of the A. P. Cess Act, 1940, the following members of the Government Body of ICAR have been elected by that Body to be members of the Standing Finance Committee for the period shown against each :—

Name	Terms
1. Shri Chandra Shekhar Singh, Member, Lok Sabha, At P. O. Banka, Distt. Bhagalpur Bihar,	For a period of one year w.e.f. 30-9-1980 or till such time thereafter as their successors are duly elected, whichever is later.
2. Prof. N. G. Ranga, Member, Lok Sabha, Nidudrolu, Pondur (A.P.)	
3. Shri Sujan Singh, Member, Rajya Sabha, Sujan Singh Park, Sonapat.	For a period of one year w. e. f. 30-9-80 or till such time as they continue to be members of the Governing body, whichever is earlier.
4. Col. Achhar Singh, Vill. & P.O. Sohal, Distt. Anantpur (Punjab).	
5. Dr. Ishwarbhai Patel, Vice-Chancellor, Gujarat Agricultural University, Ahmedabad.	
6. Dr. P. N. Bhaduri, P-1/142, Kalyani (W.B.)	
7. Dr. Daroga Singh, Director, Indian Agricultural Statistics Research Institute, New Delhi.	

[No. 2(1)/79-CDN. I]

K. L. CHHAB

Under Secy.

नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय

(नौवहन पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 18 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० आ० 62.—राष्ट्रीय नौवहन बोर्ड नियम, 1960 के नियम 3 के साथ पठित व्यापार पाव अधिनियम, 1958 (1958 का 44) की धारा 4 के द्वारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे लिखे सदस्यों को नियुक्ति कर राष्ट्रीय नौवहन बोर्ड की स्थापना करती है और श्री दौलत सिंह जादेजा, समस्त सदस्य को उक्त बोर्ड का अध्यक्ष नामित करती है, अर्थात्—

- | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1. श्री ज० सी० वर्मे | } | लोक सभा द्वारा निर्वाचित | | |
| 2. श्री दौलत सिंह जी जादेजा | | | | |
| 3. श्री बापू साहिब पारुलकर | | | | |
| 4. श्री क० ए० स्वामी | | | | |
| 5. श्री सुरेन्द्र मोहन | } | राज्य सभा द्वारा निर्वाचित | | |
| 6. श्री प्रकाश मेहरोत्रा | | | | |
| 7. सचिव, नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय अथवा उनके द्वारा नियुक्त सचिव के स्तर तक का नामित अधिकारी | } | केन्द्रीय सरकार के प्रतिनिधि | | |
| 8. सचिव, वाणिज्य मंत्रालय अथवा उनके द्वारा नियुक्त सचिव के स्तर तक का नामित अधिकारी | | | | |
| 9. उप मुख्य जल सेना स्टाफ, जल सेवा मुख्यालय, रक्षा मंत्रालय | | | | |
| 10. वित्तीय सहायकार नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय | | | | |
| 11. नौवहन महानिदेशक | | | | |
| 12. अध्यक्ष, भारतीय नौवहन नियम नि० बम्बई | | | | |
| 13. श्री टी० एन० गोकुल दास | | | } | जहाज मालिकों के प्रतिनिधि |
| 14. श्री एन० एच० धनंजी भाई | | | | |
| 15. श्री ई०के० मुखिया | | | } | भारतीय समुद्रों में |
| 16. श्री लोमोन् वाल्स | | | | |
| 17. श्री अमिन मित्रा | | | | |
| 18. श्री बी० डी०चोगले अग्रिम भारतीय जहाज मालिक परिषद | } | नाविकों के प्रतिनिधि | | |
| 19. श्री जे० एच० बोर्गी, भारतीय वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग महासंघ | | | | |
| 20. श्री डी० एम० पारेख, जल पोत उद्योग | | | | |
2. केन्द्रीय सरकार नौवहन उपमहानिदेशक, श्री आर० पद्मनाभन को उक्त बोर्ड का सचिव नियुक्त करती है।

[स० एम० डब्ल्यू/एम० एम० बी०-1/80-एम०एफ०]

विश्वनाथ शर्मा, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT

(Shipping Wing)

New Delhi, the 18th December, 1980

S. O. 62.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1958 (44 of 1958), read with rule 3 of the National Shipping Board Rules, 1960, the Central Government hereby establishes a National Shipping Board consisting of the following members and nominees,

Shri Daulat Singh Jadeja, M.P., to be the Chairman of the said Board namely:—

- | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Shri J. C. Barve | } | Elected by the Lok Sabha. |
| 2. Shri Daulat singhji Jadeja | | |
| 3. Shri Bapusaheb Paudelkar | | |
| 4. Shri K. A. Swami | | |
| 5. Shri Suresh Mohan | } | Elected by the Rajya Sabha. |
| 6. Shri Prakash Mehrotra | | |
| 7. Secretary, Ministry of Shipping and Transport, or his nominee not below the level of Joint Secretary. | } | Central Government representatives. |
| 8. Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, or his nominee not below the level of Joint Secretary. | | |
| 9. Deputy Chief of Naval Staff, Naval Headquarters, Ministry of Defence | | |
| 10. Financial Adviser, Ministry of Shipping and Transport. | | |
| 11. Director General of Shipping, Bombay. | | |
| 12. The Chairman, Shipping Corporation of India Ltd., Bombay. | } | Representatives of Shipowners. |
| 13. Shri T. M. Goculdas | | |
| 14. Shri N. H. Dhunjibhoy | | |
| 15. Shri E. K. Sukhia | } | Maritime Union of India. |
| 16. Shri Leo Barnes | | |
| 17. Shri Asit Mitra | } | Representatives of Seamen. |
| 18. Shri V. D. Chowgule | | |
| 19. Shri J. H. Doshi | | |
| 20. Shri D. M. Parekh | } | Sailing Vessels Industry. |
| 21. Shri J. H. Doshi | | |

2. The Central Government appoints Shri R. Padmanabhan, Deputy Director General of Shipping to be the Secretary of the said Board.

[No. SW/MSB-1/80-MF.]

V. N. SHARMA, Under Secy.

पर्यटन और नागर विमानन मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 16 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० आ० 63.—वायु नियम अधिनियम, 1953 (1953 का 27) की धारा 1 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, राष्ट्रपति एतद्वारा श्री क० के० श्रीवास्तव, महानिदेशक (पर्यटन) का श्री सी० बी० जैन के स्थान पर तत्काल एवं 17 जून, 1982 तक एयर इंडिया तथा इंडियन एयरलाइंस के निदेशक मंडल में निदेशक नियुक्त करते हैं।

[स० ए० बी० 1/80/1/3/3/80-ए०सी० (ए०)]
बी० तुलसीदास, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION

New Delhi, the 16th December, 1980

S.O. 63.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Air Corporations Act, 1953 (27 of 1953), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. K. Srivastava, Director General (Tourism) as Director on the Boards of Air India and Indian Airlines with immediate effect and upto 17th June, 1982 vice Shri C. B. Jain.

[No. AV. 18013/3/80-AC(A)]

V. THULASI DAS, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 20 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० आ० 64.—अंतर्राष्ट्रीय विमानपत्तन प्राधिकरण अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 43) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा श्री के० के० श्रीवान्तव, महानिदेशक (पर्यटन) को श्री सी० बी० जैन के स्थान पर तत्काल तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए भारत अंतर्राष्ट्रीय विमानपत्तन प्राधिकरण का अशकालिक सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

[स० ए० व० 24012/1/79-ए]

गोपाल चतुर्वेदी, उपा सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th December, 1980

S.O. 64.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (3) of Section 3 of the International Airports Authority Act, 1971 (43 of 1971) the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. K. Srivastava, Director General (Tourism) as part time Member of the International Airports Authority of India, with immediate effect, for a period of three years, vice Shri C. B. Jain.

[No. AV. 24012/1/79-AA]

GOPAL CHATURVEDI, Dy. Secy.

अभ्य मंत्रालय

आवेश

नई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 1980

का० आ० 65 - केन्द्रीय सरकार का राय है कि इसमें उल्लेख अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में पैराडीप पोर्ट ट्रस्ट, पैराडीप के प्रत्यक्ष मंडल से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद का न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खड्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पारदर्शीन अधिकारी श्री एम० बी० गंगारaju होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय मुम्बई में होगा और उक्त विवाद का उक्त अधिकरण का न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या पैराडीप पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रबंधन मंडल का श्री आर० सी० राम द्वारा 17-12-62 से 30-9-65 तक राष्ट्रीयकृत उद्यमों के रूप में की गई सेवा का जेष्ठ ट्रायलमेंट के सबसे में उक्त जेष्ठ के निर्धारण के प्रयोजनार्थ न गिने की कार्यवाई न्यायचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतुप का हकदार है और किस तारीख से

[स० एल० 38012/2/79-डी० IV (ए)]

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 15th November, 1980

S.O. 65.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Paradip Port Trust, Paradip and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri M. V. Gangaraju shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Bhubaneswar and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Paradip Port Trust in not counting the service rendered by Shri R. C. Das as Assistant Draftsman from 17-12-62 to 30-9-65 for the purpose of Fixation of his seniority in the cadre of senior Draftsman is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled and from what date?

[No. L-38012/2/79-D. IV(A)]

नई दिल्ली, 18 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० आ० 66 — केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उल्लेख अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में मैसर्स जे० बी० बांडा मैरीन एण्ड जनरल सर्वे एजेंसीज प्राइवेट लि०, भद्राम के प्रबंधन मंडल से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद का न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खड्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पारदर्शीन अधिकारी श्री टी० मुद्दरसन डेनियल होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय भद्राम में होगा और उक्त विवाद का उक्त अधिकरण का न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स जे० बी० बांडा मैरीन एण्ड जनरल सर्वे एजेंसीज प्राइवेट लि०, भद्राम के प्रबंधन मंडल का निर्माण 37 कर्मचारियों का 19 फरवरी, 1980 की तीसरी पारी से सीधे नियोजन से प्रकार करते और उन्हें मैसर्स चन्द्रन एजेंसीज, भद्राम, टेकेदार के पास नियोजन के लिए रियाई करने के लिए कहने की कार्यवाई न्यायचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतुप का हकदार है !

कर्मचारियों के नाम

1. श्री एम० गंगाधरन
2. श्री जी० राधाकृष्णन
3. श्री वाई० राधाकृष्णन
4. श्री एम० शेखर मनोहरन
5. श्री आर० शम्भुधर
6. श्री एच० एम० रमेश
7. श्री सी० भाषा
8. श्री जे० सिधा माधुर
9. श्री सी० आर० सत्यकृष्णन
10. श्री के० मुरीयान
11. श्री आर० वेकटरमण
12. श्री ई० गुरुनाथन
13. श्री ए० माहिन
14. श्री आर० बी० श्रीनिवासन
15. श्री आर० अली जीहून
16. श्री मानेज थाडोर
17. श्री ए० नटराजन
18. श्री टी० ए० मुद्दरेशन
19. श्री एम० डी० शिवप्रकाशन
20. श्री ई० आनन्दन

21. श्री के० एन्टो
22. श्री एन्० राधाकृष्णन
23. श्री टी० रेविज
24. श्री एन्० एस० दि० यमुन्दर
25. श्री ए० रामाक्षर
26. श्री टी० रविन्दन
27. श्री जयचन्द्रन
28. श्री ई० बालाकृष्णन
29. श्री बी० नटराजन
30. श्री आर० रामाकृष्णन
31. श्री बलराम वेंकटन
32. श्री शंकर
33. श्री एस० पी० सुरेशकुमार
34. श्री के० श्रीनिवासन
35. श्री के० चिन्तादुराई
36. श्री डी० आर० पूरनचन्द्रन
37. श्री आई० बाबू

[सं० 33011/3/80-श्री IV (ग)]

नन्द लाल, डेप्टी सचिव

New Delhi, the 18th December, 1980

S.O. 66.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs J. B. Boda Marine and General Survey Agencies Pvt. Ltd., Madras and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri T. Sundarasannam Daniel shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Messrs J. B. Boda Marine and General Survey Agencies Private Limited, Madras in refusing direct employment to the undermentioned 37 workmen with effect from the third shift of 19th February, 1980 and asking them to report to Messrs Chandran Agencies, Madras, Contractor, for employment is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?

Names of the workmen

1. Shri M. Gunasekharan
2. Shri G. Radhakrishnan
3. Shri Y. Radhakrishnan
4. Shri M. Sekhar Manoharan
5. Shri R. Shanmugham
6. Shri H. S. Ramesh
7. Shri C. Basha
8. Shri J. Sindha Madhar
9. Shri C. R. Santhanakrishnan
10. Shri K. Suriyan
11. Shri R. Venkataraman
12. Shri E. Gurunathan
13. Shri A. Mohan
14. Shri R. V. Srinivasan
15. Shri R. Ali John
16. Shri Moses Thodore
17. Shri A. Natarajan
18. Shri T. A. Sundareswaran
19. Shri M. D. Shivaprakashan
20. Shri E. Anandan
21. Shri K. Anto

22. Shri N. Radhakrishnan
23. Shri J. David
24. Shri N. S. Vijayasundar
25. Shri A. Ramadoss
26. Shri T. Ravindran
27. Shri Jayachandran
28. Shri F. Balakrishnan
29. Shri V. Natarajan
30. Shri R. Ramakrishnan
31. Shri Bernard Vangon
32. Shri Sankar
33. Shri S. P. Sureshkumar
34. Shri K. Srinivasan
35. Shri K. Chinnadurai
36. Shri D. R. Poonnachandran
37. Shri Y. Babu.

[No. L-33011/3/80-D. IV(A)]

NAND LAL, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 12th December, 1980

S.O. 67.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bastacolla Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Dhanbar, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th December, 1980.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD

Reference No. 19 of 1979

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bastacolla colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post office Dhanbar, District Dhanbad

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers : Shri S. K. Choudhury, General Manager (P), Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Dhanbad.

On behalf of the workmen : Lala B. P. Sinha, Central Executive Member, Rashtriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, 28th November, 1980

AWARD

This is a reference under S. 10 of the I. D. Act, 1947. The Central Government by its notification No. L-20012/189/78-D.III(A) dated 30th March, 1979 has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bastacolla colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post office Dhanbar District Dhanbad in stopping from work of Shri Sukhdev Prasad, Moulder and Sarvashri Mahendra Ram, Arjun Prasad and Dinesh Prasad, Moulder Hepler is justified? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled and from what date?"

2. After receipt of the reference written statements were filed by the parties. The reference thereafter proceeded along its course and ultimately today a memorandum of settlement was filed by the parties incorporating therein the terms of settlement arrived at between them in respect of the industrial dispute pending for adjudication in this Tribunal. As per the settlement the management have agreed to offer fresh employment to all the concerned workmen. Since the settlement

is beneficial to both the parties, I accept the same. Accordingly, I pass the award in terms of the settlement which do form part of the award.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer

BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 19 of 1979

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bastacolla Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Dhansar, Dist. Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen represented by Rashtriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Rajendra Path, Dhanbad (hereinafter described as the Union).

The parties named above beg most respectfully to submit as under :

1. That the parties above named have since discussed the matter with a view to amicably settle the dispute. Without prejudice the contention of the parties it is agreed to resolve the dispute on the following terms and conditions :

Term of Agreement

- It is agreed that Shri Sukhdeo Prasad will be offered employment afresh as Moulder Helper in Category-II and will be placed in Central Workshop, Ektra or any other workshop.
- That Shri Arjun Prasad will be offered employment afresh as Welder Trainee in Category-I and will be placed in Central Workshop or other suitable place.
- That Shri Mahinder Ram and Shri Dinesh Prasad will be offered fresh employment as Miner/Loader and will be placed in any colliery of Kustore Area.
- All the above 4 persons will report for duty within 15 days from the date of the agreement.

II. It is agreed that the above compromise finally resolves the pending dispute before the Hon'ble Central Government Industrial Tribunal.

It is, therefore, prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to accept the above compromise as fair and reasonable and pass an award in terms thereof.

For the Management
(S. K. CHOWDHARY)
General Manager (Pers)

For the workmen
(LALA BP SINHA)
Central Executive
Member, R.C.M.S.

(RAVENDRA SINGH)
General Manager Bastacolla Area

Witness :

- | | |
|------------------|----------|
| 1. सुकदेव प्रसाद | 27-11-80 |
| 2. अर्जुन प्रसाद | 27-11-80 |
| 3. महेश्वर राम | 27-11-80 |
| 4. दिनेश प्रसाद | 27-11-80 |

[No. L-20012/187/78-D.III(A)]

S. H. S. IYER, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 18th December 1980

S.O. 68.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the Civil Engineering Department of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Karmik Bhawan, At and Post Office Saraidhella,

District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th December, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI J. P. SINGH, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No. 2) DHANBAD

Reference No. 95 of 1979

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of the Civil Engineering Department of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Karmik Bhawan, At and Post office Saraidhella, District Dhanbad

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers : Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen : Shri R. Prasad, General Secretary, Bharat Coking Coal Staff Coordination, Jharia, Dhanbad.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal
Dhanbad, 5th December, 1980.

AWARD

This is a reference under S. 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Central Government by its notification No. L-20012/69/79/D.III(A) dated 27th July, 1979 has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the workmen of Civil Engineering Department of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Karmik Bhawan, At and Post office Saraidhella, District Dhanbad that Shri Girdhari Lal, Assistant should be promoted to Grade-I with effect from the date on which his juniors were promoted and that he should be paid wages from the 30th December, 1975, is justified? If so, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. The concerned workman, Shri Girdhari Lal, was working as attendance clerk of Jealgora colliery of M/s. East India Coal Co. (P) Ltd, when the management of the colliery was taken over by the Central Government w.e.f. 17-10-1971. At the time of take over of the management the concerned workman was in clerical grade II of the Coal Wage Board recommendation since the time of his appointment i.e. from 15-1-69. With effect from 28-7-72 he was posted to perform clerical duties in the Legal Department. Thereafter on 16-12-76 he was transferred to carry on clerical duties in Security Department, whereafter he was transferred to Civil Engineering Department on 1-11-77.

3. Before the management the question of promotion of clerical staff from grade II to grade I arose in the year 1975 in which the management also considered the case of the concerned workman along with several other. W.F.F. 30-12-75 a large number of persons were promoted from grade II to grade I. But the concerned workman was not promoted and superseded by several other junior staff. In 1977 the question of promotion was again considered and the name of the concerned workman was also considered. The concerned workman again could not be promoted and was superseded by several other juniors.

4. The case put forth by the concerned workman is that only a few months after the take over of the management and the nationalisation of the colliery he was posted to the Legal Department where his work was found to be satisfactory by his superior officers. In fact the Legal Adviser, Shri Sarda Prasad under whom Shri Girdhari Lal was working, made recommendations in 1974 about his promotion. No reason was assigned as to why the concerned workman was not selected

for promotion by the Departmental Promotion Committee when he fulfilled the two criteria of promotion, viz. (1) seniority and (2) satisfactory service. With regard to the rejection of his case for promotion in 1977 the concerned workman came to know that the confidential report of the service during 1976 was not submitted to the D.P.C. by the Personnel Department.

5. The prayer of the union is that the concerned workman Shri Girdhari Lal should be promoted to grade I w.e.f. 30-12-75 and allowed the difference of wages, bonus etc between grade I and grade II from 30-12-75.

6. According to the management the Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. has a promotion policy framed in consultation with the workmen's representatives and the promotion matter has to be considered and recommended by the D.P.C. In order to consider the case of promotion of clerical staff one such Departmental Promotion Committee was formed in 1975 and again in 1977. The management has said that the D.P.C. both the times assessed the performance and other qualifications necessary for promotion so far as Shri Girdhari Lal was concerned and declined to recommend his case for promotion. The standard fixed by the D.P.C. was stated to be rational and applied in each case without any distinction. Shri Girdhari Lal was not promoted because he failed to come upto the standard necessary for promotion. It is further said that the C.C.R. of the workmen was examined by the D.P.C. both the times and the concerned workman was found below the standard.

7. No oral evidence was adduced in this case. But both the parties have filed documents. Ext. M1 is an attested copy of C.C.R. of Shri Girdhari Lal for the period 1-1-74 to 30-6-75. Ext. M2 is an attested copy of minutes of D.P.C. held on 8-12-75. Ext. M3 is an attested copy of the minutes of D.P.C. held on 25-6-77. These were marked on admission.

8. On behalf of the union Ext. W. 1 has been filed which is a note I.A. U.O. No. 415 dated 10-12-74 from Legal Adviser to the Director (Commercial). Ext. W. 2 is a copy of note I.A. U.O. No. 1 dated 3-1-76 from Asst. Legal Adviser Shri N. C. Dutta to the Chief Personnel Manager. Ext. W. 3 is a copy of letter No. 4531(A) dated 30-9-75 certificate issued by Shri Sarda Prasad, Legal Adviser to the concerned workman and Ext. W. 4 is a copy of report No. 1360/78.D.S. dated 7th April, 1979 of the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Dhanbad to the Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Labour New Delhi. Ext. W. 5 is a copy of the promotion policy of B.C.C.I. issued on June, 1977 under which provision has been made for constitution of D.P.C. and the guide lines to be followed in the matter of selection for promotion. The concerned workman is relying on paragraph 6.1 which may be quoted below.

"For the purpose of promotion from Gr. III to Gr. II and from Gr. II to Gr. I employees will be promoted on the basis of seniority as the main criteria, subject their satisfactory performance."

The minimum qualification was also provided in Annexures A & B to this policy. In annexure B grade I clerk must be matriculate with 2 years experience in the grade below. The concerned workman is a matriculate and had put in more than 2 years service before the first D.P.C. was constituted.

9. Now let us see what conclusions can be drawn on the basis of evidence in this case. It is an admitted position that the concerned workman, Shri Girdhari Lal has been working as a clerk in Grade II since the time of his appointment in the year 1969. It is also admitted that in 1972 he was transferred to Legal Department. There is Ext. W. 1 which is a copy of a note sheet by Shri Sarda Prasad, Legal Adviser to the Director (Commercial) which is dated 30-12-74. This was for the creation of one post of Grade I clerk for Legal Department and promotion of Shri Girdhari Lal, grade II clerk to the post of grade I clerk. It appears from this document that the Legal Adviser had discussed this matter with the Director (Commercial) in a review meeting held on 13-12-74. The Legal Adviser was of the view that from the time Shri Girdhari Lal joined his department he had been doing some responsible jobs such as checking of bills of Advocates, maintaining the registers of accounts and maintaining the library of the department. He was of the view that Shri Girdhari Lal was well behaved, disciplined and his work had given him entire satisfaction. In the opinion of the Legal

Adviser Shri Girdhari Lal was doing grade I job on pay and allowance of grade II clerk due to non-allotment of a grade I post to the Legal Department. He recommended that the placement of Shri Girdhari Lal in grade I was well merited.

10. We have Ext. W. 2 which is a note sheet by Shri N. C. Dutta, Legal Adviser to the Chief Personnel Manager in which a note sheet, Ext. W. 1 was referred by him. He held the same view as the Legal Adviser did in Ext. W. 1 in respect of the merits and efficiency of the concerned workman. He strongly recommended his case for promotion. Ext. W. 2 is dated 3-1-76.

11. It will appear that the Legal Department where Shri Girdhari Lal commenced work shortly after the nationalisation of this colliery recommended his case strongly for promotion which could not be as the case if his C.C.R. was in any manner against his efficiency. Moreover, a copy of the C.C.R. from 1-1-74 to 30-6-75, Ext. M1 has been filed by the management. In Part II of Ext. M1 we find that there are 8 items covering—(1) Personality (2) Aptitude, (3) Integrity, (4) Reliability, (5) Promptness in performing assignment, (6) Punctuality, (7) Temperament and (8) Capacity to assume responsibility. In all these he has obtained C which is equivalent to good meaning thereby that he has done his job satisfactorily. There is again the C.C.R. for the year 1976 and 1977 in which he has earned mostly B and C remarks. It cannot therefore be said that before the D.P.C. any document was placed which would go to show that Shri Girdhari Lal had a bad character roll which rendered his service unsatisfactory. The minutes of D.P.C. held on 8-12-75 (Ext. M2) shows that according to seniority list Shri Girdhari Lal was No. 13 and against his name the assessment is 20. The maximum marks obtained appears to be 50. I do not understand the criteria for marking because the same has not been explained to me. Then again in Ext. M3 Shri Girdhari Lal has been placed in the seniority list as No. 19 in which the remark against him is 'No'. The others who had been selected for promotion had been shown to be O.K. It means that the marking system had undergone change in the subsequent D.P.C. Nothing has been explained to me as to how Shri Girdhari Lal has earned a 'No' in face of the recommendations made by the Legal Department where he worked. Moreover, as I have said the confidential remark showed that his work was good and satisfactory. Even according to the promotion policy the seniority and satisfactory service had to be considered and in both these matters Shri Girdhari Lal fulfilled the requirements. I therefore fail to see any reason why Shri Girdhari Lal in the year 1975 as well as in 1977 was allowed to be superseded by the juniors. On behalf of the workmen it has been submitted that the D.P.C. acted arbitrarily in considering the case of the concerned workman and the management adopted unfair labour practice in refusing to promote him. It may be mentioned that during July, 1979 Shri Girdhari Lal was promoted to grade I. To my mind, it is clear, that the promotion of Shri Girdhari Lal was delayed by the management for no good reason whatsoever. At least it has not been shown before me that there was anything wrong with Shri Girdhari Lal in the matter of seniority or C.C.R. which rendered him unfit for promotion in the year 1975 or in 1977. The workmen's contention is that since the C.C.R. for 1976 had not been sent by the Administrative Department to the D.P.C. his case was not considered. The management has nothing to say about it. Now if this is true it was unfair on the part of the D.P.C. to reject the case of his promotion due to the default on the part of the Administrative Department.

12. Thus, having considered all aspects of the case I hold that the demand of the workmen of Civil Engineering Department of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Karmik Bhawan, At and Post office Saraidhella, District Dhanbad that Shri Girdhari Lal Assistant should be promoted to Grade-I with effect from the date on which his juniors were promoted and that he should be paid wages from the 30th December, 1975 is justified. Consequently, Shri Girdhari Lal, Assistant is entitled to all the back wages and other emoluments with effect from 30th December, 1975.

This is my award.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer,
Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal (No. 2) Dhanbad.
[No. L-20012/69/79-D.III(A)]

S. H. S. IYER, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 19th December, 1980

S.O. 69—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal Hyderabad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramagundam Division No. 1, Godavari Khani, Karimnagar District, Andhra Pradesh and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th December, 1980.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL) AT HYDERABAD

Industrial Dispute No. 15 of 1979

BETWEEN

Workman of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramagundam Division No. 1, Godavari Khani, Karimnagar District (A.P.).

AND

The Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited Ramagundam Division No. 1, Godavari Khani, Karimnagar District (A.P.).

APPEARANCES :

1. Shri A. Lakshmana Rao, Advocate for the Workman.
2. Shri K. Srinivasa Murthy, Advocate for the Management.

AWARD

On an industrial dispute that arose between the Management of Ramagundam Division No. 1 of the Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Post Office Godavari Khani, District Karimnagar (Andhra Pradesh) and their Workman in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule, the Government of India by its Order F. No. L. 21012(21)/78-D IV(B), Ministry of Labour New Delhi dated 12-3-1979 referred the same to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 7A and 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited in dismissing from service Shri B. Narayana, Clerk, Godavari Khani No. 2A Incline with effect from 11th June, 1978 is justified? If not to what relief is the concerned Workman entitled?"

2 The case of the Workman is briefly as follows:—He joined the service of this Management in 1964 and served for 14 years without any blemish. While he was working as Clerk at the Office of the Coal Screening Plant at Godavari Khani, a Charge-sheet dated 23-2-1978 with false allegations was served, and a case was foisted on him at the instance of Shri Mandadi Vengaiah, Commission Agent for coal and Sri Abdul Hameed, Watchman. He had not committed any misconduct as alleged in the charge sheet and the order of dismissal dated 11-6-1978 is illegal and unjustified. The report is based entirely on the evidence of Management's witnesses eschewing from consideration the Workman's evidence without any justification. The Enquiry Officer failed to consider two important facts (1) that it took nearly 24 hours for the Management to record the statement of M. Vengaiah and (2) when Mr. Vengaiah stated that (Rajiniah) was with him when he paid a sum of Rs. 500 to the Workman as bribe at about 7.15 P.M. on 17-2-1978, a different person by name Kasaliah was examined in regard to the same. But on that day he worked in the Office in General Shift and he had nothing to do with the issue of challans, lorry loading, and weightment of lorries. In the light of clear evidence that he left Godavari Khani by bus at 6.30 P.M. and reached Ramagundam Railway Station at 7.00 P.M. on 17-2-1978, the Enquiry Officer should have seen that he was not at all present at the alleged place and time to receive bribe, and the case was foisted against him at the instance of Vengaiah and the Watchman, and the Senior Inspector. S&PC took advantage of the alleged incident to implicate this Workman because of the grudge he bore against this Workman. The Enquiry Officer dis-believed the evidence of the witness produced on behalf of this Workman on the ground of pendency of a Civil suit against him filed by the Management. This is obviously an untenable ground. This Workman had nothing to do with the lorry loading, weightment or issuing challans. In awarding punishment, the

Management failed to take into consideration the previous record and extenuating circumstances as required under Standing Order 16(c) and on this ground alone the order of dismissal is liable to be set aside. At any rate the punishment is excessive and he is entitled for reinstatement with back wages and attendant benefits.

3. The case of the Management is briefly as follows:—

An enquiry has been conducted into the charge levelled against this Workman and in the enquiry it was found that he was guilty of the charges. So the allegations that a false case was foisted against this Workman at the instance of Vengaiah and Watchman is not correct. The Enquiry Officer found the Workman guilty of the charges on the basis of the evidence on record and the same cannot be said to be perverse. Even after taking into account the past record of the Workman, the Management did not find any extenuating circumstances to award a lesser punishment than that of dismissal for the misconduct committed by him. As the punishment awarded to this Workman is just and valid, the reference has to be rejected.

4. My learned Predecessor held by order dated 19-2-1980 that the domestic enquiry which was conducted by this Management was fair and proper and hence I have not referred to the respective pleadings of both sides with regard to the same. So the only points that have to be considered are : (1) Whether there are any circumstances warranting interference with the finding of the Enquiry Officer and (2) if there are no circumstances to interfere with the finding of the Enquiry Officer, whether there are any grounds to interfere with the punishment.

5. Point 1 :—The Management examined the witnesses to prove its version. Mandadi Vengaiah is a commission agent of Sri Bathi Padda Venkataiah of Hanamakonda and he stated as follows:—On 17-2-1978 he took the permit from this Management at about 10 A.M. and he went to the C.S.P. Office of this Management and took permission for loading two lorries. Between 3 P.M. to 4.30 P.M. on the same day, he got two more lorries and then again he took permission from the C.S.P. Engineer for getting those two lorries loaded. The fourth lorry bearing No. AAT 1642 was sent to lorry weigh-bridge for obtaining the weight of the empty lorry and he arranged for its loading. In the meanwhile, the three other lorries brought by him were loaded and sent away. At about 7.00 to 7.15 P.M. on the same day, the Workman herein called him to the tea shop and demanded an amount of Rs. 600 from him for releasing one lorry with coal without challan and permit. The Workmen herein wanted to spare Rs. 100 to the Watchman. First the said Vengaiah was not agreeable for the said course and later on he told the Workman that he would pay only Rs. 500 and he paid that amount to the Workman, and the Workman herein agreed for the same. Then the Workman gave two challans and Rs. 100 out of those Rs. 500 to Vengaiah asking him to pay the same to the Watchman at the check post by asking him to state to Watchman 'Narayana' and if any trouble would arise he could represent that he had forgotten to bring the challan.

6. Abdul Hameed, the Watchman of this Management stated as follows.—At about 5 P.M. on 17-2-1978 this Workman came to him and requested, him to release one loaded lorry without challan by taking an amount of Rs. 100. But he did not agree. Then this Workman requested him to reconsider about it and he would again come at 7 P.M. and he left the place. Then he sent word to Junior Inspector of this Management asking him to come to the check-post. Then that Junior Inspector went to this Watchman at about 5.40 P.M. on the same day and this Watchman informed him as to what transpired between him and this Workman. Then the Junior Inspector informed this Watchman that he would immediately go to the Senior Inspector, and asked this Watchman to tell this Workman that he would agree for that course if he would again come to him. Then the Junior Inspector went to the Senior Inspector and both of them came to this Watchman and stood in a cabin behind this Watchman from 6.30 P.M., at about 7.00 P.M. this Workman came to this Watchman and asked for his opinion for releasing the lorry and then this Watchman agreed for it and both the Inspectors heard the conversation between the Workman and this Watchman. The lorry AAT 1642 with coal reached the gate and when this Watchman asked for the challan, Vengaiah gave Rs. 100 and faked challan and when this Watchman called the Inspectors while stating loudly 'Sab, Sab', then Vengaiah took back the amount and the faked challan and then the

Inspectors came to the lorry and when challan was demanded, Vengaiah stated that it was not brought. Then the Senior Inspector went to the Weigh-Bridge clerk and verified from the record therein that this lorry was not weighed. Hence the matter was reported to the Colliery Executive Engineer, and the lorry was detained. On the following day statement was recorded from Vangaiah.

7. The two Inspectors corroborated the version of the Watchman to the extent to which they are witnesses. Kasaiah supported the version of Vengaiah. P. Srinivasa Rao, I.E. stated that he had seen this Workman going towards Railway Siding Check-post on a cycle at 6.45 P.M. on 17-2-1978 when he was at the loads yard.

8. This Workman had come with the following version :—
On the morning of 17-2-1978 he obtained the oral permission of the concerned Executive Engineer to avail permission on 18-2-1978, as he had to go to Kamalapuram, his native place. Till 5.30 P.M. on that day, the I.E. and CHP were in the Office, and he too was in the Office. Then he went away on bicycle. He took tea at his house and again started at 6.30 P.M. on that day to Godavari Khani Bus Stand to go to Ramagundam Station, and reached Ramagundam Station at 7.00 P.M. There he met M. Eshwar. Both of them left by Kazipet train at 9.30 P.M. He also produced a certificate from Sarpanch in his defence in the enquiry to show that on 18-2-78 he was at his native place.

9. The Enquiry Officer believed the witnesses for Management. He dis-believed the version of Eshwar the witness for the Workman on the ground that there was litigation between the said Eshwar and this Management. Further the Enquiry Officer also felt that even if in fact this Workman went to his native place on that night, it does not affect the version of the Management as the train left at 9.30 P.M. while according to Vengaiah, the arrangement between him and this Workman was finalised at 7.15 P.M. or 7.30 P.M.

10. The learned counsel for the Management contended as follows :—There is nothing to dis-believe the version of the Watchman and the Senior and Junior Inspectors, and this Workman had come up with a belated version that the Senior Inspector had a grudge against him in respect of an incident or incidents said to have happened in 1965 i.e. about 13 years back and it was not even suggested like that to the Senior Inspector. The belated version of the Workman in regard to the grudge against him by the Watchman and also Vengaiah cannot also be believed as the same was not suggested to either of them. The version for the Management clearly shows that the loaded lorry was detained when an attempt was made to take it away without challan, and there is no need either for the Inspectors or for the Watchman to foist a case against this Workman.

11. It was further urged for Management as follows :—
The Enquiry Officer rightly dis-believed the version of Eshwar in view of a dispute between him and the Management, and even otherwise if it can be stated that this Workman left for his native place by train at 9.30 P.M. on that day, it does not affect the version of the Management or the arrangement made by this Workman at 7.30 P.M. on that day.

12. It was contended for the Workman as follows :—
Though the Junior Inspector stated that even on 17-2-1978 the statement of Vengaiah was taken, it was not filed and so much reliance cannot be placed upon the statement of Vengaiah which was said to have been taken on 18-2-1978 and which was filed in Court. Adverse inference has to be drawn for not filing the earlier statement. Till Kasaiah was examined before the Enquiry Officer, it was not stated that he was with Vengaiah at the time of conversation between Vengaiah and this Workman. Even otherwise the evidence of Kasaiah shows that he is not a reliable witness. So the un-corroborated version of Vengaiah, who is in the nature of an accomplice, cannot form the basis for holding this Workman guilty. The Enquiry Officer was not justified in dis-believing the version of Eshwar, the witness for the Workman simply because there is litigation between him and this Management. This Workman had an unblemished service under this Management for about 14 years. He was in no way concerned with the loading of the lorry. In view of the previous hostility between this Workman and the Senior Inspector, the Watchman, and Vengaiah, this case was foisted against him.

13. The Watchman stated that he did not know this Workman by the time he approached him on 17-2-1978 at 5.00 P.M. But both the Senior and the Junior Inspectors stated that they knew this Workman by 17-2-1978, and they identified him when he had conversation with the Watchman at 7.00 P.M. on 17-2-1978. So if there is no enmity between those Inspectors and this Workman, and if those Inspectors had no oblique motive, then their version can be believed. This Workman admitted that he had no enmity with Junior Inspector, but he stated that the Junior Inspector might have stated falsely to oblige the Senior Inspector who is his superior. The Workman stated at the time of examination by the Enquiry Officer, that in 1965 there was a tussle between him and the Senior Inspector in regard to some incidents, and hence the Senior Inspector bore grudge against him, but he admitted before the Enquiry Officer that he did not complain to anybody. However it is not even suggested like that to the Senior Inspector. So it can be stated that this Workman had come up with a belated version in a vain attempt to see that the evidence of the Senior Inspector is discredited. So in view of the material on record it can be stated that both the Senior and the Junior Inspectors are true witnesses.

14. In regard to the Watchman and Vengaiah, this Workman stated that when he was the clerk of the Weigh-Bridge, those 2 persons asked him to allow them to take coal over and above the coal noted in the permits, and as he had not obliged them, they bore grudge against him. But he had not suggested like that to either of them. Hence it can be stated that the above version of this Workman is belated.

15. It is true that the evidence of Kasaiah does not inspire confidence. If the only material available is the evidence of Vengaiah and Kasaiah, then as it can be stated that the evidence of Kasaiah is not believable on the basis of the un-corroborated version of Vengaiah, who is in the nature of an accomplice, this Workman cannot be held guilty. (It is admitted for Workman that Vengaiah in his evidence referred to only Kasaiah but not Rajaiah).

16. It cannot be stated that the view of the Enquiry Officer that the evidence of Eshwar, the witness of the Workman, cannot be believed on the ground of litigation between him and the Management as perverse. Even the version of the Sarpanch that this Workman was in his village on 18th February, 1978, does not effect the version of the Management for the train left Ramagundam at 9.30 P.M. on 17-2-1978, while this incidence was said to have taken place at 7.30 P.M. on 17-2-78.

17. It is true that if the earlier statements are not filed, then much reliance cannot be placed on the later statements. But in this case, I already observed that if this case has to be considered solely upon the evidence of Vengaiah and Kasaiah, then the Workman herein cannot be held guilty. But I already observed that the two Inspectors are truthful witness, and on the basis of their evidence this Workman can be held guilty.

18. While the Watchman stated that this Workman approached him at 5.00 P.M. and when the Inspectors stated that this Workman had again come to the Watchman at 7.00 P.M. Vengaiah stated that for the first time on that day this Workman called him at 7.15 or 7.30 P.M. Then a doubt arises as to whether the Workman met Vengaiah only after finalising the deal with the Watchman, or whether he approached the Watchman after settling the deal with Vengaiah. I already observed that Vengaiah is in the nature of an accomplice. In his own interest, he might not have come up with entirely true version. So either it might be a case where Vengaiah had come up with wrong version in regard to time and this Workman approached the Workman after settling the deal with Vengaiah, or it might be a case that this Workman after finalising the affair with the Watchman approached Vengaiah and had a deal with him, and Vengaiah might have come with a true version with regard to the time. So when the two Inspectors are treated as truthful witnesses, this aspect also does not affect their version.

19. So in view of the material on record, the finding of the Enquiry Officer can be accepted and I find accordingly.

20. Point 2 :—This is a case of taking bribe for abetting theft. Such acts of abetment of theft are admittedly grave offences and so the Management is justified in dismissing this Workman for the above proved charge, even though he had an unblemished service for about 14 years.

21. But the learned counsel for the Workman contended that even if it can be held that the charge is proved, it has to be stated that he might have been a scape goat, and hence it is not proper to impose an extreme punishment of dismissal.

22. It is clear that even the accused stated that he was a weigh-bridge clerk on some days. In such a case, he is familiar with the procedure to be adopted by the customers in taking coal on permit from the Office of this Colliery. Admittedly he was not the weigh-bridge clerk on 17-2-1978. So when he was not the weigh-bridge clerk, and if he was in no way concerned in regard to the delivery of coal, then there is no need for other persons to utilise the services of this Workman in getting the coal sent out of the premises. It is not a case where this Workman was very close with the Watchman. While the Watchman stated that he did not know the name of this Workman by the date of this incidence, this Workman had come up with a belated version that this Workman was enmical to him as he refused to allow this Watchman, who was said to be dealing in coal, to take coal more than what is noted in the permit. So when this Workman was not close with the Watchman concerned, then there was no need for the persons concerned with the delivery of coal to utilise the services of this Workman. Of course without the connivance of some other persons of this Colliery there was no possibility of getting the lorry loaded, when the challan was not produced and when the necessary slip from the weigh-bridge clerk was not issued. Anyhow merely because some other persons connived at the transaction and they were not caught, it is not a ground for taking lenient view against this Workman, when the material on record suggests that he is the brain behind this transaction, and hence I do not find any reason to interfere with the punishment and I find accordingly.

23. In the result, I find that the action of the Management in dismissing this Workman from service is justified and the Award is passed accordingly.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him and corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 24th day of November, 1980

V. NEELADRI RAO, Presiding Officer

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE

Witnesses Examined :

For Workman :

For Management :

W.W. 1 Sri B. Narayana.

Nil.

Documents Exhibited by the Management :

Ex. M1 Charge sheet dt. 23-2-78 issued by the Management to Sri B. Narayana.

Ex. M2 Reply to the charge sheet submitted by Sri B. Narayana to the Management dt. 24-2-78.

Ex. M3 Management's letter dt. 27-3-78 to Sri B. Narayana

Ex. M4 Enquiry Proceedings dt. 5-3-78.

Ex. M5 Material Papers filed in Enquiry Proceedings.

Ex. M6 Enquiry report pertaining to Sri B. Narayana.

Ex. M7 Dismissal order dt. 11-6-78 issued to Sri B. Narayana by the Management.

Documents Exhibited by the Workman : Nil

V. NEELADRI RAO, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-21012(21)/78-D.IV.B]

New Delhi, the 20th December, 1980

S.O. 70.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramakrishnapur Division, Adilabad District (Andhra Pradesh), and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th December, 1980.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL) AT HYDERABAD

Industrial Dispute No. 8 of 1978

BETWEEN :

Workmen of Singareni Collieries Company Limited,
Ramakrishnapur Division, Adilabad District. A.P.

AND

The Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited,
Ramakrishnapur Division, Adilabad District.
A.P.

APPEARANCES :

Sri A. Lakshmana Rao, Advocate—for the Workmen

Sri K. Srinivasa Murthy, Hon. Secretary, Federation of
A.P. Chambers of Commerce and Industry—for the
Management.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, under Sections 7A and 10 (1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by its Order F. No. 1-21011(1)/77-DIV(B) dated 28th March, 1978 has referred to this Tribunal the following issues for adjudication in the industrial dispute between the workmen and the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramakrishnapur Division, Adilabad District.

"Whether the action of the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramakrishnapur Division in asking the Shotfirers Grade 'C' to perform duties of Mining Sirdars in addition to their own and on their refusal to do so not allowing them to perform their normal work with effect from 6th April, 1977 to 19th April, 1977 is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled and from what date?"

2. The reference was registered by this Tribunal as Industrial Dispute No. 8 of 1978 and notices were sent to parties concerned

3. A joint memo dated 15th October, 1980 was filed by the Workmen and the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramakrishnapur Division praying for passing an award in terms of the settlement. Sri S. Nagi Reddy, President, Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union, Bellampally and Sri D. Subramaniam, Divisional Personnel Officer, Bellampally who is permitted to represent the General Manager, Bellampally as per orders in MP., are present today and they admitted the terms of the settlement.

4. After having gone through the terms of the settlement, it can be stated that it is just and proper and it is in the interest of both the concerned workmen and also the Management. Such proper and just settlement have to be accepted in order to see that cordial relationships between the workmen and the management are maintained. Hence, in the circumstances, it is a fit case for passing the award in terms of the Settlement especially when it is stated that Clause 1 of the terms of settlement was already implemented.

5. Award is passed accordingly in terms of the settlement between the parties. Copy of the settlement is herewith attached as part of the award.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him and corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 18th day of November, 1980.

V. NEELADRI RAO, Presiding Officer

Memorandum of Settlement arrived at under Rule 58(4) of I.D. (Central Rules), 1957 between the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited and their Workmen represented by the Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union, Bellampally on 25th April, 1980.

On Behalf of the Management.

1. Sri S. P. Ahuja,
General Manager,
Bellampally.

- 2 Sii P T Thomas,
Personnel Officer,
Belampalli
- On behalf of Union
- 1 Sii S Nagaish Reddy,
President TCML Union,
Bellampalli
- 2 Sii B Venkat Rao,
Vice President,
TCMI Union Belampalli

SHORT RECITAL OF THE CASE

The Shot Firer grade C of RK 4 Incline, caused a stoppage of work from 1st shift on 6th April, 1977 alleging that they were asked to perform both the jobs of a Shot Firer and the Mining Sirdar. The Management's contention was that the management was justified in asking them to perform both the jobs of Shot Firers and Mining Sirdars as less than 30 persons only were employed at a working place. The strike at RK 4 Incline continued till 18th April, 1977 and spread to other Mines in Ramakrishnapur Division during this period and K K 5 and K K 5A of M M Division also in one shift resulting in loss of output to a tune of 6500 tonnes valued at Rs. 4 55,000 at RK 4 Incline and 25 556 tonnes valued at Rs. 18 13 520 in the entire Ramakrishnapur Division during the period from 6th April, 1977 to 19th April, 1977. The Labour Machinery intervened and held discussions separately. Ultimately, the matter was referred to the Tribunal and registered as I D 8 of 1978 with a reference as under:

Whether the action of the Management of SC Co Ltd., Ramakrishnapur in asking the Shot Firers 'C' grade to perform duties of Mining Sirdars in addition to their own and on their refusal to do so not allowing them to perform their normal work with effect from 6-4-77 to 19-4-77 is justified? If not to what relief is the concerned workmen entitled and from what date?"

The matter was discussed between the management and the Union at length and to maintain Industrial harmony and cordial relations and it has been agreed as follows:

- 1 The Management agreed to assess the requirement of Mining Sirdars and designate the Shot Firers 'C' grade as Mining Sirdars depending on their seniority and requirement in the Mines in RKP Division by 1st May, 1980
- 2 The Management agreed to sort-out the anomalies, if any, of the Shot Firers and Mining Sirdars of Ramakrishnapur Division
- 3 The Management and workmen represented by the Union agreed for adjusting the period of strike by Shot Firers towards any leave available to their credit and the balance to be treated as leave on loss of pay, on application by them
- 4 The Union accepts this settlement as full and final settlement of their claim filed by the Union before the tribunal in I D 8 of 1978
- 5 Parties agree to file this settlement before the Tribunal for passing an Award

Representing Management

- Sd/-
- 1 S P Ahuja,
General Manager,
Belampalli
- Sd/-
- 2 P T Thomas,
Personnel Officer,
Belampalli

Representing Union

- Sd/-
- 1 S Nagaish Reddy,
President, TCML Union
Belampalli
- Sd/-
- 2 B Venkat Rao,
Vice President
TCML Union, Belampalli

WITNESSES

- Sd/-
- 1 D Subrahmaniam,
Distl Personnel Officer,
Belampalli

- Sd/-
- 2 K V Krishna Rao,
Clerk,
Personnel Department, Bpa.

V NEELADRI RAO, Presiding Officer
Industrial Tribunal
[No L-12011/1/77 D IV B]
S S MEHTA, Desk Officer

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 19 दिसम्बर 1980

का० अ० 71 बन्दाय मन्का का राय है कि मस उपाबन्ध अनुसूचा म विनोदित विषय क बारे म दक्षिण मध्य रेलवे मिकन्दराबाद क प्रबन्ध मंडल मे सम्बद्ध है। आद्योक्त विवाद निम्नलिखित और उक्त क वक्तव्य व बीच विद्यमान है

और कन्दय मन्का उक्त विवाद का न्यायनिर्णयन क लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनाय समझता है

अतः बन्दाय मन्का आद्योक्त विवाद क्रिस्तियम 1947 (1947 71 11) की रू० 7 के आ० द्वारा 10 की उपावा (1) क खंड (घ) 2 की प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करत हुए एवं आद्योक्त उपावकरण लागू करता है जिसमे पाठ्यात्मक आधकारी श्री बा० नाला राव हाग जिनका मन्थालय हैदराबाद म है। और उक्त विवाद का उक्त आधकारी का न्यायनिर्णयन क लिए निर्देशित करता है।

अनुसूचा

क्या उपाबन्ध क म उल्लंघन आकाम्मन श्रमिक जिनकी सहाय प्रभागीय इंजीनियर (डबलिंग) दक्षिण मध्य रेलवे, विजयवाडा द्वारा आद्योक्त विवाद क्रिस्तियम 1947 की द्वारा 25 के उपावन्ध का पालन किए बिना समारण कर दी गई थी और जिनकी सेवाया का 10-5-75 म यथापूर कर दिया गया है 10-5-75 से 9-5-75 तक की अवधि के लिए किसी मजदूरी क हक्दार है? यदि हाँ तो किस सीमा तक।

उपाबन्ध "क"

- 1 श्री क रती जहान
- 2 श्री पी० र माकाटा
- 3 श्री पा० वक्टेष्टवर राव
- 4 श्री व० मन्थनारायण
- 5 श्री व० शिरपथईय
- 6 श्री एन० रामचन्द्र राव
- 7 श्री एम० जाहन
- 8 श्री व० नरामम्हम
- 9 श्री धन्तुरु काटाय
- 10 श्री एन० अरुन्धान
- 11 श्री के० वक्टेष्टवर राव
- 12 श्री पी० जावाराय
- 13 श्री० नागामपणन
- 14 श्री० काटेष्टवर राव
- 15 श्री गुताला रानी
- 16 श्री एन० यशुदेवम्मा
- 17 श्री व० नागरत्नम
- 18 श्री डी० नागेश्वरम्मा
- 19 श्री पी० कमावम्मा
- 20 श्री कला विमालम्मा
- 21 श्री डी० रत्नाम्मा
- 22 श्री बीम गलिजावेथ
- 23 श्री व० काटेष्टवरम्मा
- 24 श्री नी० कमलावर राव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 19th December, 1980

SO 71.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of South Central Railway, Secundra-bad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri V. Neeladri Rao shall be the Presiding Officer with head quarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal

SCHEDULE

“Whether the Casual Labour mentioned in ‘Annexure A’ whose services have been terminated by the Divisional Engineer (Doubling), South Central Railway, Vijayawada on 10th May, 1975 without complying with the provisions of Section 25-B of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, and who were re-instated from 10th August, 1978 are entitled to any wages for the period from 10th May, 1975 to 9th August, 1978? If so, to what extent.”

ANNEXURE ‘A’

1. Shri Koreti John
2. Shri P. Ramakoti.
3. Shri P. Venkateswara Rao.
4. Shri K. Satyanarayana
5. Shri K. Thirupathaiah.
6. Shri L. Ramachandra Rao.
7. Shri S. John
8. Shri K. Narasimhan
9. Shri Bandaru Kotaiah.
10. Shri N. Arogyam.
11. Shri K. Venkateswara Rao.
12. Shri P. Zakariaiah.
13. Ch. Nagabhushanam.
14. Ch. Koteswara Rao.
15. Shri Gutala Rani.
16. Shri N. Yesudevamma
17. Shri K. Nagarathnam.
18. Shri D. Nageswaramma
19. Shri Venu Kamalamma.
20. Shri Kaila Vimalamma
21. Shri D. Rutnamma.
22. Shri Venu Elizabeth.
23. Shri K. Koteswaramma.
24. Shri B. Kamalakara Rao

[No. I-41011(2)/79-D II. B]

आदेश

का० आ० 72 --केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपावद्ध अनु-सूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में खाद्य निगम के प्रबन्ध मंडल में सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजका और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद का न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वाछनीय समझती है,

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-न और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एक औद्योगिक अधिग्रहण गठित करती

है जिसके पीछास्तीव अधिनियम की की० नीलाद्री राय हागे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद का उक्त आग्रहण का न्यायनिर्णयन का निम्न निर्दिष्ट वर्तन है।

अनुसूची

क्या क्षेत्रीय प्रबन्धना भारतीय खाद्य निगम हैदराबाद का श्री अश्विन बरीद, सुरक्षित कर्मकार और भारतीय खाद्य निगम फार्मालक कर्मकारों गण का अध्यक्ष का निजामाबाद से विशाखापत्तनम स्थानान्तरण करने का कार्यावधि न्यायवाचन है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किम अनुलोप का हकदार है?

[स० एल-12012(25)/79-डी० II(बी)]

ए० 410 एम० शर्मा, डस्क आग्रहण

ORDER

SO 72.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exist between the employers in relation to the management of Food Corporation and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri V. Neeladri Rai shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the Regional Manager, Food Corporation of India, Hyderabad in transferring Sri Abdul Wahced, Protected workman and Chairman of Food Corporation of India Executive Employees Union, from Nizamabad to Vsakhapatnam is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

[No. L-42012(25)/79-D.II(B)]

A V S SHARMA Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 20th December, 1980

SO 73 —In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Food Corporation of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 15th December, 1980

BEFORE SHRI MAHESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 160 of 1977

In re :

Shri Gian Chand Gulati, 9/260, Four Storey DDA Flats, Gahni, East of Kailash, New Delhi-110024.

Petitioner

Versus

The Zonal Manager (North), Food Corporation of India, Ansal Bhavan, Kasturba Gandhi Marg, New Delhi.

Respondent

PRESENT :

Shri L. M. Sabharwal—Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri K. A. Dewan—Advocate for the Corporation

AWARD

The Central Government as appropriate Government vide its Order No. L 42012/21/75/DIIB dated the 15th Novem-

ber, 1975, as amended vide order dated the 28th August, 1976, referred an Industrial Dispute under Section 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 in the following terms to Industrial Tribunal, Delhi :

Whether the action of the Zonal Manager (North) Food Corporation of India, New Delhi, in terminating the services of Shri Gyan Chand Gulati, Messenger, with effect from 20th June, 1974 (afternoon), is justified. If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

2. On receipt of the reference it was ordered to be registered and usual notices were sent to the parties by Industrial Tribunal, Delhi, whereupon a statement of claim was filed by the workman on 16th January, 1976, whereafter a requisite corrigendum was received and as such a fresh statement of claim was filed on 8th December, 1976 in the meanwhile the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi relinquished charge and the matter under reference was transferred to this Tribunal, in May, 1977 whereupon it was ordered to be registered and notices were again issued to the parties. In pursuance thereof the Management filed its written statement on the 3rd November, 1977 and the replication was filed on 16th February, 1978. Upon the pleadings of the parties the following two issues were framed by me for trial :

1. Whether the reference is invalid as alleged?

2. As in the order of reference.

3. Thereafter the evidence of the parties was recorded and arguments of representatives of the parties were heard and after giving my considered thought to the matter before me I have come to the following findings upon these issues.

4. Issue No. 1 :

As the order of reference would show the dispute is between the Food Corporation of India and their workmen and it has been contended in this behalf by the respondent—Food Corporation of India that it is not an Industry and as such no reference could be made under section 10 of the I.D. Act. It is further alleged that the provisions of I.D. Act are not applicable to the Food Corporation of India and therefore the reference is incompetent. During the course of arguments the Id. counsel for the Corporation did not press this issue and rather conceded that the Food Corporation of India is an Industry and the provisions of I.D. Act are applicable to it. Even otherwise there was no escape from the conclusion that the Food Corporation of India is an Industry keeping in view the latest pronouncement of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Bangalore Water Supply & Sewage Board case. Furthermore a reference to definition of appropriate Government u/s 2 of the I.D. Act would itself show that the provisions of I.D. Act are applicable to the Food Corporation of India. Furthermore there is nothing in the Food Corporation Act, 1964 which excludes the operation of Industrial Dispute Act from the Food Corporation of India. From whichever angle the matter may be considered the only conclusion which can be arrived at is that Food Corporation of India is an Industry and is governed by Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 and as such there is no merit in issue No. 1 which is accordingly decided in favour of the workman and against the management. Incidentally it may be mentioned here that it has not been urged that the matter under reference has not been referred by the competent appropriate Government or that no proper demand was raised or that Shri Gyan Chand Gulati is not a workman or that the matter under reference has not been properly espoused.

5 Issue No. 2 :

A perusal of order of reference would show that the reference relates to the termination of the services of Shri Gyan Chand Gulati, a messenger with the Food Corporation of India w.e.f. 20th June, 1974.

6. The contention of the workman is that he was appointed by the Food Corporation of India, Northern Region Office, New Delhi and he joined services on 29th May, 1970 and on completion of his probationary period he was confirmed in 1971 and that his work throughout had been satisfactory and he had been earning his normal yearly increments; that in so far as the workman was indisposed he applied for medical leave w.e.f. 17th June, 1974 and remained on leave upto 22nd June, 1974 but when he reported for duty on 24th June,

1974 (23rd June, 1974 being Sunday) the Zonal Manager (North) where the workman was posted at the relevant time informed the workman that his services had already been terminated w.e.f. 20th June, 1974 (AN) and as such he was not permitted to join duty; that the termination was illegal, unjustified, punitive, wrongful and malafide and the workman was entitled to be reinstated with full back wages.

7. In its written statement it has been contended by the Food Corporation of India that the Food Corporation was not an Industry and as such the present reference was incompetent; that the workman was insolent in his behaviour; that he was irregular in the attendance of his office and was earlier on number of occasions warned for remaining absent without any leave from 17th June, 1974 he had not applied for any leave and as such his services were terminated w.e.f. 20th June, 1974(AN) and that the services were terminated in pursuance of the powers vested in the Corporation under regulation 19 of the Corporation and as such the termination was valid and justified and the workman was not entitled to any relief.

8. In order to establish his contention the workman has come forward himself as W.W. 1 apart from tendering into evidence his duly sworn affidavit Ex. W/1 and documents Annexure A to F. During cross examination he has stated that it was incorrect to suggest that his leave record was not satisfactory. It has further been stated by him that it was incorrect that he did not apply for leave well in time according to the rules of service. He has stated that he did not remember if he had received letter Ex. M/1 or Ex. M/2. It is finally stated by him that it was incorrect to suggest that he had not submitted any application for leave on 17th June, 1974 or that he had not submitted any medical certificate either. He has admitted the correctness of Ex. M/3 and endorsement Ex. M. 3/1 on the part thereof to be in his hand writing. Lastly he has denied that he was working during the period of his unemployment.

9 To rebut this evidence of the workman the Corporation has examined Shri S. C. Mukherjee, Deputy Manager (Legal) as M.W. 1 and he has produced in evidence as affidavit Ex. M.W. 1/1 apart from letter Ex. M.W. 1/2. During cross-examination it would be found that he had not been in the service of the Corporation at the relevant time when the services of this workman were terminated and therefore it is admitted by him that he had no personal knowledge about this matter. It is also admitted by him during cross examination that the workman never worked under his supervision. It is then stated by him that he was dealing with litigation matters since 1977 but he has never dealt the personal or administrative matters. It is admitted by him that whatever communications are received by the Food Corporation of India are entered into central receipt registry and similarly all communications which are sent out of the FCI office or despatched are entered by the concerned division. Regarding this workman he has stated that he has seen the workman only in the zonal office and now in the court. It is admitted by him that the workman was a confirmed employee. He has not been able to deny that the employee Gyan Chand Gulati was paid increments regularly. He had not even brought the personal file of the employee. He has admitted that he had no knowledge to the effect that the workman was ever charge sheeted for his work or for his conduct. It is also admitted by him that there is nothing on the record to show that the conduct or behaviour of the workman was not upto the mark. He has exhibited his ignorance as to the time when the action regarding the termination of the services of this workman was initiated. It is also admitted by him that no service compensation was offered or paid till today to the employee. When cross examination he has stated that he has only heard say evidence of the officials of his office that the workman was running a vegetable shop and preparing envelopes for sale but he had no personal knowledge. Thus from the perusal of the testimony in cross-examination of this witness it is clearly established that this witness had absolutely no personal knowledge about this case and in the face thereof it would be difficult to give any credence to the statement made by this witness in his affidavit Ex. M.W. 1/1. I have perused his affidavit and from the perusal thereof I find that although during cross-examination he has admitted that he had no personal knowledge with regard

to the conduct of the workman or the circumstances of the termination of the services of this workman or other matters connected therewith but strangely enough in the verification of the affidavit he has verified that 'the contents of the aforesaid affidavit are true and correct to my knowledge and belief'. In the face of this contradiction no weight whatsoever can be placed upon the testimony of this witness. It is nowhere suggested in this affidavit that the knowledge forming the basis of this affidavit Ex. M.W. 1/1 has been derived by him from the office record or on information received. It is also not stated by him that the officer who had terminated the services of this workman had left the service of this Corporation or has retired and strangely enough said officer has not been examined. Thus no reliance can be placed upon the testimony of Shri S. C. Mukherjee, Deputy Manager in this case. He has produced a memorandum Ex. M.W. 1/2 which only shows that the workman had preferred an appeal dated 1st October, 1974 and the same was filed there being no provision relating to an appeal against the termination orders passed by this office. This is a document which would not be of such relevance for the purposes of the question referred to this court. In this context it would be appropriate to refer to Ex. M. 1 to Ex. M. 3 which evidenced only that this workman had been availing leave without getting its sanction before availing it.

10. I have already discussed the evidence produced by the Management which does not in any manner validate or justify the order of termination of the services of the workman. I would now like to refer to annexure I which is the original order of termination of the services of the workman and is dated 20th June, 1974 and reads 'under regulation 19 of the Food Corporation of India (staff) Regulation, 1971 the services of Shri Gyan Chand Gulati, Messenger are hereby terminated from 20th June, 1974 (AN). He will be eligible to draw 90 days pay in lieu of this notice'. Annexure B is the application dated 25th June, 1974 submitted by the workman to the Zonal Manager when he was not permitted to resume duty on 24th June, 1974 in which he has reiterated that he was on medical leave w.e.f. 17th June, 1974 to 23rd June, 1974 and he had sent an application through post under U.P.C. and had reported for duty after fitness with fitness certificate. In this letter he has challenged the termination of his services. Ex. Annexure-C is the letter of demand raised by the workman with the respondent sent to the Zonal Manager (North) of the Corporation while Annexure D is the demand notice sent to the Managing Director of the Corporation. Ex. Annexure F is the statement of claim filed before the Conciliation Officer. Annexure E is the minutes of conciliation proceedings held before the Conciliation Officer. All these documents are admitted on behalf of the management which alleges that his services have been terminated as he was allegedly absent from duty without any leave from 17th June, 1974 but the workman has consistently taking up the position that he has sent a leave application on 17th June, 1974 as he had fallen sick and that he had reported for duty together with a medical fitness certificate on 24th June, 1974 when he was informed that as his services had been terminated on 20th June, 1974 vide Annexure A. The contention of the workman that the services have been terminated in violation of all the provisions of the Industrial Dispute Act is clearly established in the instant case. It is clear from the written statement of the Corporation that his services were terminated under rule 19 of the Staff Regulation 1971 because the workman was absent without any leave from 17th June, 1974. Even assuming that the workman was absent from 17th June, 1974 without any leave it was not open to the Corporation to have re-course to rule 19 in the instant case because the alleged absence of the workman was governed by the definition of mis-conduct under the Industrial Employment Standing Orders and as such this absence could have been and should have been a subject of disciplinary action against the workman and could not straightway form a cause of action for action under Regulation 19. It may be mentioned here that under section 3 of the Regulations 1971 Regulation No. 24 item No. VI itself provides that 'an employee willfully absenting from duty after the expiry of leave shall also be liable to disciplinary action'. Although there is no regulation providing for a disciplinary action for absence from duty without any leave but the same principle which is incorporated in item No. VI referred to above would be applicable in such a case also. It would be similarly appropriate to refer here to item No. 12 of Regulation 24 which provides that an employee who remains absent beyond that

period (5 years continuously) will cease to be an employee of the Corporation. This in the circumstances it was not open to the Corporation to have re-course to regulation 19 and such a re-course in the instant case is a malafide. Reference here may also be made to item No. IV of regulation 24 which further provides that 'in case where an employee is compelled to absent himself from duty on account unforeseen circumstance without obtaining prior sanction, sanction for leave should be applied for at the earliest possible opportunity. Obviously sudden illness would be unforeseen circumstance in which case this provision would immediately come into operation and the workman has stated in para 2 of his sworn affidavit that 'as I was indisposed therefore I applied for medical leave w.e.f. 17-6-74 and remained on leave till 22-6-74. Application for leave was sent on 17.6.74 under postal certificate. I joined my duty on 24-6-74 (23.6.74 being Sunday) I had medical cum-fitness certificate with me. it may be mentioned here that it is admitted by M.W. 1 that a receipt register was maintained in the Corporation wherein all receipts are entered but strangely enough neither the said register has been produced nor the Incharge who was maintaining that register has been produced to prove that no such application as referred to had been sent by the workman was ever received in the office of the Corporation on the relevant date. Assuming that the workman was in the habit of absenting himself without his obtaining sanction of the leave even that would form subject matter of a disciplinary action and proceeding against the workman and that fact in itself cannot be sufficient to enable the Corporation to have re-course to Regulation 19 and to terminate the services of the workman. Another important fact which cannot be lost sight of in the instant case is that the workman had not been absent for a unduly long period. On the 4th day of his absence his services were terminated by the Corporation. It appears as if the Corporation was already decided to dispense with the services of the workman on the least pretext and this is what has been done in the instant case. Strangely enough in Ex. M.W. 1/2 it is stated by the Corporation that there was no provisions for any appeal against the order of termination in the instant case, while in its written statement the Corporation has alleged that the regulations provided for an appeal and as no appeal was preferred, this reference is bad. The Corporation cannot blow hot and cold in the same breath. This case has exhibited a very sorry state of affairs in the Corporation. Whereas it was expected that as a Public Corporation it would be a model employer, the conduct of the Corporation in the instant case exhibits nothing but its high handedness in the dispensing with the services of a poor messenger. It has been urged on behalf of the Corporation that the services having been terminated under Rule 19, it was not open to this court to go behind the order, but it has been observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Gujarat Steel Tubes Ltd. and Gujarat Steel Tubes Mazdoor Sabha—1980(40) FLR-152 that 'Masters and servants cannot be permitted to play hide and seek with the law of dismissals and the plain and proper criteria are not to be mis-directed by terminological cover-ups or by appeal to psychic process but must be grounded on the substantive reason for the orders, whether disclosed or undisclosed. The Court will find out from other proceedings or documents connected with the formal order of termination what the true ground for the termination is. If thus scrutinised, the order has a punitive flavour in course or consequence. It is dismissal. If it falls short of this test, it cannot be called a punishment. To put it slightly differently, a termination effected because the master is satisfied of the misconduct and of the consequent desirability of terminating the service of the delinquent servant, it is a dismissal, even if he had the right in law to terminate with an innocent order under the standing order or otherwise. Whether, in such a case the grounds are recorded in a different proceeding from the formal order does not detract from its nature. Nor the fact that, after being satisfied of the guilt, the master abandons the enquiry and proceeds to terminate. Given an alleged misconduct and a live nexus between it and the termination of service the conclusion is dismissal even if full benefits as on simple termination, are given and non-injurious terminology is used. On the contrary, even if there is suspicion of misconduct the master may say that he does not wish to bother about it and may not go into his guilt but may feel like not keeping a man he is not happy with. He may not like to investigate nor take the risk of continuing a dubious servant. Then it is not dismissal but termination simpliciter, if no injurious record of reasons or punitive pecuniary cut-

back on his full terminal benefits is found. For, in fact, misconduct is not then the moving factor in the discharge. What is decisive is the plain reason for the discharge, not the strategy of a non-enquiry or clever avoidance of stigmatising epithets. If the basis is not misconduct the order is saved. In the instant case the entire written statement of the Corporation flows on the basis that the services were terminated as the workman was habitually absent from duty and last time absent from duty on 17th June, 1974 and therefore recourse was had to regulation 19. The action in the instant case of the Corporation is clearly punitive and mala-fide and a camouflage. The alleged absence of the workman could form basis of a disciplinary proceedings against the workman but the Corporation appears to have been ill advised to have re-course to regulation 19 and terminated the services of the workman and in the circumstances the action of the Corporation cannot be upheld and accordingly I hold that the action of the Zonal Manager (North) Food Corporation of India New Delhi in terminating the services of Shri Gyan Chand Gulati, Messenger w.e.f. 20th June, 1974 is unjustified.

11. The action would be further illegal on the ground that it has not complied with the requirements of Section 25-F of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947. It has been observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in its latest pronouncement in Santosh Gupta Vs State Bank of Patiala 1980(40) FLR 373 that 'retrenchment would include a termination of services of the type involved in the instant case' and essentially if the provisions of Section 25-F have not been complied with the termination would be illegal, unjustified and unenforceable. It is admitted by M.W. 1 that certainly in the instant case provisions of Section 25-F were not complied with and no retrenchment compensation was paid to the workman and for that reason also the termination in the instant case is not justified.

12. Coming to the question of relief there is nothing which even remotely suggest that the workman has dis-entitled by his conduct himself from the normal relief of reinstatement with full back wages, particularly in view of his categorical statement that he was un-employed during the period his services have remained terminated, there being no rebuttal by the Corporation, I hold that the workman is entitled for reinstatement with full back wages from the date of his termination of his services.

13. Accordingly it is awarded that the action of the Zonal Manager (North), Food Corporation of India, New Delhi in terminating the services of Shri Gyan Chand Gulati, Messenger with effect from 20th June, 74(AN) is illegal, unjustified and not enforceable and the workman is hereby reinstated with full back wages from the date of termination of his services. He would also be entitled to the costs of these proceedings which are assessed at Rs 500.

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer

Dated : the 27th November, 1980.

[No. L-42012/21/75-D.II(B)]

A. V. S. SARMA, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 दिसम्बर 1980

का० आ० 74 -- खान अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 35) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवर्तन शक्ति को का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री सोम प्रकाश बंसल को मुख्य खान निरीक्षक के अधीन निरीक्षक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[न० ए-12025/3/79-एम 1]

जिनेन्द्र कुमार जैन, प्रवर, सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th December, 1980

S.O. 74—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Som Prakash Bansal as Inspector of Mines subordinate to the Chief Inspector of Mines.

[No. A-12025/3/79-M. I]
J. K. JAIN, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 22nd December, 1980

S.O. 75—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India, Malerkotla Branch and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th December, 1980.

BFFOR: SHRI MAHESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-1 ABOUT COURT, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 100 of 1980

Camp at : Chandigarh

Shri Nachatar Singh S/o Shri C. L. Bhardwaj, 878, Nai Sarak, Chandni Chowk, Delhi. Petitioner

Versus

The Regional Manager, State Bank of India, Region I, Sector 17-B, Chandigarh.

PRESENT :

Neno for the workman

Shri V. K. Gupta, Asstt. Law Officer of the Bank.

AWARD

The Central Government as appropriate Government vide its order No. L-12012/9/80-II. A dated the 20th September, 1980 referred an Industrial Dispute u/s 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 to this Tribunal in the following terms:—

'Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India (Region-I), Chandigarh in not providing employment to Shri Nachatar Singh,, Ex. Guard, Branch Office Malerkotla on and after 6th March, 1976 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?'

2. On receipt of the reference it was ordered to be registered and usual notices were sent to the parties while none has appeared for the workman for the three hearings the case was fixed. Shri V. K. Gupta has appeared for the Management and he has come forward with the following statement :

Statement of Shri V. K. Gupta on S.A.

'In this case the workman has already been offered appointment as a Guard and he is presently working at Sangrur Branch of our Bank and as such the reference has become infructuous.'

3. In view of the statement of Shri V. K. Gupta read in the light of order of reference I do find that the reference has become infructuous. In fact from the conduct of the workman in not appearing also it has shown that he is no longer interested in this reference. In these circumstances it is awarded that the reference has become infructuous and is filed. Parties are however left to bear their own costs.

Further Ordered :

That requisite number of copies of this award may be sent to the appropriate Govt. for necessary action at their end.

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer.

Dated : the 29th November, 1980.

[No. L-12012/9/80-D. II(A)]

S.O. 76—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of United Commercial Bank, Bombay and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th December, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI JITENDRA NARAYAN SINGH, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2, Bombay

Reference No. CGIT-2/45 of 1980

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of United Commercial Bank, Mafatlal Centre, 2nd Floor, Natiman Point, Bombay-21

AND

Their workmen.

INDUSTRY : Banking

STATE : Maharashtra

Bombay, the 1st December, 1980.

AWARD

The Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal by order No. L-12012/117/79-D.IIA dated 1-10-1980 :—

"Whether the action of the management of United Commercial Bank in relation to their Kalamb Branch, Taluka Ambegaon, District Pune in terminating the services of Shri N. P. Deole, Assistant Cashier with effect from 15-1-1979 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled".

On receipt of the reference notices were issued to the parties for filing their claim/written statements.

The Bank by its letter dated 29-10-1980 submitted that the reference may be treated as closed since the matter has been amicably settled between the parties by offering fresh appointment to Shri N. P. Deole, the concerned workman. The General Secretary, the Poona Bank Employee's Association, Pune by his letter dated 31-10-1980 addressed to the Ministry and copy to this Tribunal stated that Shri N. P. Deole has now been re-employed as Clerk at Pimpri Branch and he may be allowed to withdraw the dispute.

In the circumstances I have no other alternative but to pass a 'No dispute' award in this reference and give my award accordingly.

Sd./-

JITENDRA NARAYAN SINGH, Presiding Officer

[No. L-12012(117)/79-D.II(A)]

S.O. 77.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of United Commercial Bank, Pune and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th December, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI JITENDRA NARAYAN SINGH, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2, BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-2/49 of 1980

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of United Commercial Bank, Pune

AND

Their Workman.

INDUSTRY : Banking

STATE : Maharashtra

Bombay, the 1st December, 1980.

AWARD

The Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following

industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal by order No. L-12012/118/79-D.IVA dated 23-10-1980 :—

"Whether the action of the management of United Commercial Bank, Bombay in terminating the services of Shri S. P. Borde, Typist, Ganeshkhind Road Branch of the Bank with effect from 19-10-1978 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

On receipt of the reference notices were issued to the parties for filing their claim/written statements.

The Bank by its letter dated 13-11-1980 submitted that the reference may be treated as closed since the matter has been amicably settled between the parties by offering fresh appointment to Shri S. P. Borde, the concerned workman. The General Secretary, the Poona Bank Employee's Association, Pune by his letter dated 31-10-1980 addressed to the Ministry and copy to this Tribunal stated that Shri S. P. Borde now been re-employed as Clerk at Pune Camp Branch and he may be allowed to withdraw the dispute.

In the circumstances I have no other alternative but to pass a 'No dispute' award in this reference and give my award accordingly.

Sd./-

JITENDRA NARAYAN SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. L-12012(118)/79-D.II(A)]

S.O. 78.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Allahabad Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th December, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI MAHESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 10 of 1978

In re :

The President,

All India Allahabad Bank Employees' Association,
Katariwali, Gali, Jaiganj, Aligarh. ...Petitioner

Versus

The Asstt. General Manager,

Allahabad Bank, Hazrat Ganj,
Lucknow. ...Respondent

AWARD

The Central Govt. as appropriate Govt. vide its Order No. L-12012/94/77-D.IIA. dated the 17th January, 1978 referred an Industrial Dispute under Section 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 to this Tribunal in the following terms :

"Whether the action of the management of Allahabad Bank in termination the services of Sri Arvind Kumar Gupta, Cash Clerk, Muslim University, Aligarh Branch w.e.f. 3-3-1977 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the said workman is entitled?"

2. On receipt of the reference usual notices were sent to the parties whereupon a statement of claim was filed on 5th April, 1978 by the workman side. A written statement was filed on 1st June, 1978 by the Bank and finally replication was filed on 3rd July, 1978 on which date following one issue was framed for trial :

1. As in the order of reference.

3. Thereafter the case was adjourned for evidence of the parties. The workman examined himself as W.W. 1 apart from Shri Jugal Kishore as W.W. 2 while the Bank has examined only M.W. 1 Shri J. N. Malhotra in support of their respective contentions apart from producing certain documents. I have gone through the evidence produced by the parties and have heard their representatives and after giving my considered thought to the matter before me I have come to the following findings :

4. The contention of the workman is that he was initially employed in the service of the respondent-Bank in pursuance of his application dated 18-5-1972 and he continued to work as relieving cash clerk until he was permanently absorbed in the service of the Bank but to his

utter dismay his services were terminated by the Bank under para 522(i) of the Sastry Award on the alleged ground of concealment of qualifications which was illegal and unjustified and as such he was entitled to be reinstated with full back wages.

5. The contention of the Management is that no doubt that this workman was initially appointed in 1972 as a relieving cash clerk but that appointment in the course of time matured into a regular appointment but before such regular appointment the workman had been directed to file an application in which he disclosed his qualification as having passed intermediate examination while in fact he had passed B.A. examination and that if the fact of his having passed B. A. examination had been disclosed by the workman then he would not have been appointed as a regular cash clerk with the Bank in as much as the Graduates were not eligible to apply for such posts and therefore the Bank had terminated his services under para 522(i) of Sastry Award after giving him notice pay etc. and as such termination was valid.

6. The workman as W.W. 1 has supported his statement of claim and has stated that he had passed Intermediate examination of the UP Board at the time when he joined service of the Bank in the year 1975 and thereafter he submitted an application Ex. W/1 in which he mentioned that he had passed Part-I of B.A. from Agra University in 1971 while he has stated that before his temporary appointment in the Bank he was studying in a college but appeared for the B.A. (Pass) in March-April, 1972. He has further stated that he did not know that Graduates were not appointed as Cash Clerks in the Bank and he worked in various branches of the Bank for 3 years in temporary capacity and during this period he found that Graduates were also working as Cash clerks and then he specifically mentioned that S/Shri S. K. Nigam, Anil Kumar and Shri S. K. Sharma were such persons in Mahoba branch of the Bank (Aligarh) and it was thereafter that he had represented for Graduation allowance being paid to him in January, 1976 and when he submitted his representation he was not told anything by the Bank and then he was called to file an explanation by the Bank to which he submitted his reply which he proved to be Ex. W/2. Then he has stated that he had filed in the form Ex. W/3 on the same facts as they existed at the time when he joined temporary service of the Bank in 1972 and therefore he did not mention the factum of his Graduation in the said form as he did not know that Graduates were not employed at the time when he submitted Ex. W/3 and it was only during the office work that he learnt about the increments and therefore he submitted his representation in January, 1976. Then he has stated that there was no malafide on his part to withhold any facts and that if he had known that this would be a disqualification he would have certainly mentioned it in his form Ex. W/3. During cross examination he had admitted that Ex. W/3 was in his handwriting and he had read the proforma before filling it and had also read the declaration at page 6 of the proforma. It is further stated by him during cross examination that he took the written test on 8-12-1974 while his interview was held on 2nd February, 1975 and that he was Graduate at the time of interview.

7. The Bank has examined M.W. 1 Shri J. N. Malhotra, the Establishment Officer of the Bank who has in his statement in chief stated that vacancy was advertised on 19.11.72 for appointment as cashiers and proved the copy of the same to be Ex. M/1 and stated that in pursuance of this advertisement the workman also filed an application and after it was approved Ex. W/3 was got filed from him in which the workman mentioned his educational qualification as Intermediate although he had passed Graduation in 1972 and it was in consequence of his application that he was appointed but for his withholding the information as to his being a Graduate he would not have been appointed. He has further stated that the bank came to know of the factum of his Graduation in 1976 when the workman claimed Graduation allowance vide letter Ex. M/2 and thereupon the bank terminated the services of the workman after giving him three months notice pay. During cross examination it is admitted by this witness that the workman was appointed on temporary basis on 18-5-72 and he was under Graduate at that time and he was posted to a permanent vacancy in 1975 i.e. 22-10-1975. W.W. 2 is Shri Jugal Kishore who

has produced Ex. W.W. 2/1 and Ex. W.W. 2/2 which are photostat copies of the appointment letter issued to Shri Anil Kumar and Shri Shankar Khanna who were Graduates and were appointed as permanent cashiers.

8. In the light of the above evidence produced by the parties it is established beyond any shadow of doubt that the workman had been appointed after he was approved for temporary appointment as a relieving clerk vide letter dated 17-5-1972. The workman has produced copy of the application dated 18-5-1972 in pursuance whereof he was initially appointed as relieving cash clerk. From the perusal of this copy I find that the workman has clearly mentioned in it that he had passed B.A. Part-I examination after having qualified his intermediate examination of the University. The entire claim of the Bank is based upon application dated 14-4-1975 which is Ex. W/3 in which the workman has given in the column for qualification that he had passed matriculation and intermediate examination and has not made any mention of his having passed B.A. examination. However the fact that the workman had taken the test on 8th December, 1974 as stated by him during his cross examination as W.W. 1 and that he was interviewed on 2nd February, 1975 again stated in his cross examination as W.W. 1 have not been rebutted or denied by either M.W. 1. Once this fact is established that this workman had taken the test on 8th December, 1974 and had even been interview on 2nd February 1975 any reference to application dated 14-4-1975 Ex. W/3 loses all relevance. The appointment would be deemed to have been in pursuance of written test held on 8th December, 1974 and followed by interview held on 2nd February, 1975. In this contest a reference may be made to the statement M.W. 1 Shri J. N. Malhotra in which he has produced a copy of advertisement dated 19-11-1972 published in the National Herald of 19th November, 1972 in which applications were invited. The said advertisement is Ex. M/1. A note to this advertisement shows that the applications were to be submitted within 15 days i.e. not later than 4th December, 1972. The regular appointment of this workman was admittedly in pursuance of this notification and application was required to be submitted in pursuance of this notification Ex. M/1 within a fortnight and strangely enough the Bank has not cared to produce the said application. The question arises whether the workman had not disclosed the factum of his having passed B.A. examination in the said application also? Non-production of the said application would go against the Bank and as such it would be difficult for me to accept the contention of the Bank that the Bank had been kept in dark about this workman having passed B.A. examination. The circumstances in which application dated 14-4-1975 Ex. W/3 was got filled in and signed have not been explained. This application has an air of confusion around it in so far as the application in pursuance of notification Ex. M/1 was submitted and has not been produced and the workman had been required to take the test and was even interviewed before the Ex. W/3 was purported to have been signed. Keeping in view all these facts it becomes difficult to accept that the Bank has established that the workman had conceded his having passed B.A. examination when he applied for the post of cash clerk in pursuance of advertisement Ex. M/1. The bank having failed to establish the concealment at the time of his having applied initially it cannot be held that the Bank was justified in terminating the services under para 522(i) of the Sastry Award on the plea that the information furnished in application dated 14-4-1975 Ex. W/3 was incomplete. In any case it is clearly mentioned in application dated 18-5-1972 Ex. W/1 that the workman had passed Part I of B.A. examination. The workman has categorically stated in his statement that Ex. W/10 was the copy of the application which he had submitted before joining the temporary service of the Bank. The bank has not produced the original application and presumption of such non production would be that if the bank had produced such an application it would have gone against the Bank. Similar would be the presumption against the Bank for non production of the application which must have been submitted by the workman in pursuance of notification Ex. M/1. In the face of all these facts it would not be possible for me to accept the contention of the Bank. In any case it cannot be accepted that the Bank has established any malafide on the part of the workman in not mentioning his having passed B.A. In the application dated 14-4-1975 which is Ex. W/3.

9. Reference here may be made to para 2 of Ex. M/2 which is the explanation submitted by the workman to the Bank in which it is stated by him that he had already informed about his having passed Graduation to the A.G.M., Lucknow in the last week of September, 1972. Said A.G.M. has not been produced by the bank for reasons known to the Bank. It is also stated in para 3 of the said explanation Ex. M/2 that in February, 1975 when he was called for second time interview he had attached all copies of certificates and mark sheets as required by their letter. The same also has not been produced by the Bank for reasons known to the Bank. In fact the Bank has not cared to produce the complete service record of the workman except Ex. W/3. The bank is guilty of not producing the best evidence to establish its claim and as such the Bank must fail and I will hold that the Bank was not justified in terminating the services of the workman under para 522(i) of the Sastry Award.

10. Let us consider the matter from yet another angle. The workman has alleged that the Bank has appointed other Graduates as cash clerks which fact is not denied by the Bank in its written statement and which fact is rather established conclusively by the statement of W.W. 2 who has produced copies of appointment letters of at least two persons which are Ex. W.W. 2/1 and Ex. W.W. 2/2 which go to establish that certainly the Bank had been appointing even Graduates. The position of Anil Kumar and Shankar Khanna does not appear to be materially different from the position of this workman Arvind Kumar Gupta and it has not been shown by the Bank that the services of these workmen have been likewise terminated. This all goes to show that the action of the Bank was mala fide and partisan also and consequently is more in the nature of victimisation than bonafide and honest exercise of powers vested by para 522 (i) of Sastry Award.

11. Although it has not been agitated in the statement of claim but it has been argued before me that in any case the termination of services of the workman in the instant case tantamounts to a termination in violation of Section 25-F of the I. D. Act, 1947 in so far as requisite compensation u/s 25-F has not been paid to the workman. Certainly of the principle of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Santosh Gupta's case goes to show that the termination in the instant case attracted the provisions of Section 25-F and in so far as those provisions have not been contemplated it would follow that the termination is bad in law and is legal and not justifiable.

12. In view of my discussions above, I have come to the conclusion that certainly the termination of services of this workman are illegal and unjustified and void and as such it is awarded accordingly and the workman is entitled to reinstatement. It has not been established that the workman had been engaged gainfully during this period. It is not even so alleged by the Bank. In view of all these facts I hold that the workman would be entitled to full back wages.

13. For my discussions and findings above, it is awarded that the action of the Management of Allahabad Bank in terminating the services of Shri Arvind Kumar Gupta, Cash Clerk, Muslim University Aligarh Branch w. e. f. 3-3-77 is illegal and unjustified and the workman is directed to be reinstated with full back wages. The workman would also be entitled to costs of these proceedings which are assessed at Rs 500.

Further Ordered :

Requisite number of copies of this award may be sent to the appropriate Govt. for necessary action at their end.

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-12012/94/77-D II (A)]

Dated. the 25th November, 1980

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 1980

S.O. 79.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government

hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Bangalore, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Vijaya Bank Limited Bangalore and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16-12-80.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL IN KARNATAKA, BANGALORE

Dated this the 12th day of December, 1980.

PRESENT :

Sri H. Shanmukhappa, B.A., B.L., Presiding Officer

Central Reference No. 9 of 1978

I PARTY

Workmen represented by
the General Secretary,
Vijaya Bank Employees'
Association, No. 67, 2nd Floor,
Kengal Hanumanthaiiah Road,
Shanthinagar, Bangalore-27

Vs.

II PARTY

The Chairman,
Vijaya Bank Ltd.,
Administrative Office,
2, Residency Road,
Bangalore-560027.

APPEARANCES :

For the I Party :—Sri S. Krishnaiah, Vice President of
Bharathiya Mazdoor Sangh, Bangalore.

For the II Party :—Sri R. N. Narasimha Murthy,
Advocate, Bangalore.

REFERENCE

(Government Order No. I-12011/101/78-D, IIA
dated 7-10-78).

AWARD

As per Order No. L-12011/101/78-D.IIA dated 7-10-78 issued in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7-A read with clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

"Whether the proposed action of the management of Vijaya Bank Ltd, Bangalore to transfer Shri H. Subhaya Shetty, President of Vijaya Bank Employees' Association from Administrative Office of the Bank to the Kempegowda Road Branch, Bangalore is justified? If not, to what relief is Shri H. Subhaya Shetty entitled?"

2. In his claim statement, the I Party workman has stated as follows :—

When the II Party came to know that the I Party workman did not join the K. G. Road Branch, they have transferred two persons Varanballi and Krishna Shetty to Planning and Development Department, Administrative Office, Residency Road, Bangalore-25 where the I Party workman is working and further the said two persons have been allowed seats adjacent to the I Party workman. The I Party has further stated that about a few days ago Varanballi attacked him in Hotel Chalukya and a criminal case is pending against Varanballi on the file of Metropolitan Magistrate, Bangalore. The II Party Bank having failed in all the attempts to cause substantial harm and injury to the I Party workman, in a desperate mood, has instructed Varanballi to give a complaint against him putting forth false, baseless allegations so as to give a handle to the Bank to keep the I Party workman under suspension and initiate departmental proceedings against him on the basis of the complaint, and punish him. He has further stated that at this point of time the Bank has determined to victimise the I Party workman; that the acts of the II Party Bank amount to unfair labour practice. The

II Party Bank passed the order transferring the I Party workman in order to interfere with the functioning of the Association with mala fide intention to divide the Association and to make other members of the Association leave it and join the newly former Organisation sponsored at the instance of the Bank. Having contended accordingly, the I Party workman submitted that the proposed transfer order made by the II Party is not justified and the same may be cancelled.

3. In their counter statement the II Party have submitted that the dispute is not maintainable in law as the transfer of the I Party workman cannot be the subject matter of an industrial dispute under the I. D. Act, as the I Party workman is not a workman as defined under the Act and therefore the reference is illegal and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the merits. They have denied that the Association has a membership of about 5000 employees as alleged by the I Party. The II Party management had no hand in the formation of Vijaya Bank Workers Organisation. The I Party workman had been working in the Administrative Office of the Bank ever since 1969. As exigencies of administration rendered it necessary the I Party workman Subbaiah Shetty was sought to be transferred from the Administrative Office to the Bangalore Branch in Kempegowda Road which is hardly 2 Kilometres from the Bank. The proposed transfer does not in any manner affect the activities of the I Party workman who is said to be the President of the Association, the apprehension raised in this behalf being purely imaginary. The allegation of mala fide intention on the part of the management to divide the Association and interfere with its functioning are denied as baseless and false. The averments made in para 7 of the claim statement are denied as incorrect and being irrelevant. There is neither victimisation nor unfair labour practice involved in the proposed transfer of I Party which was done in the interest of administration. Having contended accordingly the II Party submitted that the reference may be rejected.

4. As no additional issues arose from the pleadings, the points of dispute in the Reference were set down for consideration.

5. MW-1 was examined in part on behalf of the II Party and the case was posted for cross examination of MW-1. Exhibits M-1 to M-20 also have been marked on behalf of the II Party.

6. On 11-12-1980, when the case was called the II Party filed a memo stating that without prejudice to the contentions raised in the statement of objection filed by the II Party and without admitting the various allegations made against it in the claim statement by the I Party the II Party submitted that the proposed transfer of the I Party workman from the Administrative Office of the Bank to Kempegowda Road Branch, Bangalore will not be implemented. Having stated accordingly the II Party submitted that the reference does not survive for further consideration, and requested to pass an award accordingly. The I Party's counsel Sri B. V. Puttegowda, who was present has stated that he has no objection for recording the memo filed by the II Party.

7. As contended by the II Party, the reference does not itself survive for adjudication as they have undertaken not to give effect to the order of transfer passed by the II Party in this reference. Therefore, adjudication regarding justification or otherwise of the action of the II Party in transferring the I Party workman does not arise. Accordingly, the following Award is passed :—

AWARD

In view of the above, an Award is passed rejecting the reference as the points of dispute has not survived for adjudication. Ordered accordingly. No order as to costs.

H SHANMUKHAPPA, Presiding Officer.

12/12/80

[No. L-12011/101/78-D.II(A)]

S.O. 80.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Union Bank of India, and their workman Shri Mithan Lal

Gupta, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th December, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI MAHESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,

NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 153 of 1977

In re :

The General Secretary,
Union Bank of India Employees' Union,
Khan Baoli,
Delhi.

...Petitioner

Versus

The Zonal Manager,
Union Bank of India,
26-28, D. Block, Connaught Place,
New Delhi.

..Respondent

AWARD

The Central Government as appropriate Government vide its order No. L-12013/122/74-FR.III dated the 20th February, 1975 referred an industrial Dispute u/s 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal, Delhi in the following terms :

'Is the management of the Union Bank of India, New Delhi justified in reverting Shri Mithan Lal Gupta, Head Shroff, with effect from the 12th October, 1973 and if not to what relief is the said workman entitled ?'

2. On receipt of the reference it was ordered it be registered and usual notices were sent to the parties to appear on 8th April, 1975. A statement of claim was filed on behalf of the workman on 5th May, 1975 whereafter written statement was filed on the 29th July, 1975 and replacement was filed on 25th August, 1975. Upon pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed by Shri D. D. Gupta, Industrial Tribunal, Delhi for trial :

1. Whether the applicant is a workman within the meaning of Sec. 2(S) of the I.D. Act.
2. Whether there is a valid and proper espousal and if not its effect.
3. Whether the reference is not maintainable for the reason that the applicant has been dismissed from service.
4. As in the term of reference.

the case was then adjourned for evidence of the workman. The workman examined three witnesses and produced some documents. Whereafter the Management produced its evidence consisting of M.W. 1 but before any further proceedings could be held by Industrial Tribunal, Delhi the appropriate Government transferred this reference to this Tribunal in July, 1977. In consequence the case was registered a fresh and notices were issued to the parties. After the parties appeared the evidence of the Bank was completed. Later on in July, 1978 it was found that the order of transfer was open to certain objections and as such a fresh order of transfer was passed and in consequence following statements of the representatives of the parties was recorded on 20-7-73 :

Statement of Shri Madan Mohan and S. S. Sethi for the respective parties as also of Shri M. L. Gupta on SA.

We adopt the proceedings so far held by this Tribunal and the case may be proceeded with from the present stage only.

3. After the evidence of the Management was completed the case was adjourned for evidence in rebuttal of the workman. After the evidence of the workman was completed following statement of the workman was recorded on 14-9-79:

Statement of Shri M. L. Gupta on SA

'It is correct that there are about 11 vouchers in 4 bundles produced by way of illustration by this management today which are not signed by me but the fault is with official current department. I might have been busy in the cash department at the time of receipt of cash by cashiers.'

The case was then adjourned for arguments. I have heard the arguments of the Id. representative of the parties and have gone through the file and after giving my considered thought to the matter before me I have come to the following findings upon these issues :

4. The contention of the workman is that he was employed in the then Union Bank of India Limited in 1958 and he was promoted as Head Shroff w.e.f. 1st March, 1971 vide letter dated 14-4-71; that this promotion was subject to six months probation; that the said period of probation was extended with retrospective effect from 1-9-1971 vide letter dated 14-12-1971; that the workman was later issued a letter dated 7-3-72 by the Bank advising him to improve his over all performance but he was neither confirmed nor his probationary period was extended; that all of a sudden after the expiry of one year and seven months of the issue of letter dated 7-3-72 the workman was reverted to the post of Head Cashier category E-cum-Special Assistant; that the said reversion was illegal and invalid as no charge sheet was issued to the workman before this reversion nor any enquiry was held against him; that the demotion of the workman was mala fide, arbitrary, illegal and unjustified, that the workman protested against the said demotion vide his letter dated 22-10-1973 which was rejected by the Bank vide its letter dated 8-1-1974; that later on a charge sheet dated 28-11-1973 was served upon the workman and enquiry was held and ultimately the workman was dismissed from service; that the workman is entitled to be reinstated to his promoted post and grade w.e.f. the date he was demoted unjustifiedly and hence this case.

5. The Management has in its reply contended that the subject matter of the dispute referred to by the Govt. does not amount to an Industrial Dispute as the claimant was reverted from the post of Head Shroff and the post of Head Shroff is the post of an Officer and not the workman; that the dispute had not been validly espoused; that the workman had been dismissed vide letter dated 10-12-1974 as a result whereof the reference has become infructuous. On merits the facts are not disputed except that it is alleged by the Bank that the work of the claimant was not found satisfactory and he did not come up to the standard expected of him as a result whereof he was reverted and later on dismissed from service for charge which were subject matter of an enquiry and it has been urged that the workman was not entitled to any relief in this case.

6. In replication the claimant side has contended that the Head Shroff was also a workman and as such the reference was a valid reference; that the dispute has been properly espoused; that the dismissed from the service is not effected the validity of the reference and the reference has not become infructuous. It is in the light of these respective contentions that these issues have to be determined.

7. Issue No. 1.—The Management has contended that Shri M. L. Gupta was reverted from the post of Head Shroff and the Head Shroff is an Officer of the Bank in Bank's officer cadre and is not a workman and as such any dispute regarding reversion from the post of Head Shroff does not amount to an Industrial Dispute. The fact that Shri M. L. Gupta was promoted to the Bank's officer cadre grade II is conclusively established by Ex. W/2 which is attested true copy of the letter No. STT (28266) dated the 14th April, 1971 whereby Shri Gupta was promoted. This copy has been produced by the workman himself and I have no reason to doubt its correctness. In the very first para thereof it is mentioned in this letter that 'we are pleased to offer you promotion to the Bank's officer cadre Grade II on the terms and conditions of service set out below.' It would be now too late in the day for Shri M. L. Gupta to allege that he was not an officer of the Bank in cadre Grade II at the time when his reversion took place. Mere fact that his duties inter-alia included some such duties which could sometimes be performed or could also be performed by a workman would not in the instant case make any difference what so ever and Shri M. L. Gupta would be treated as an Officer of Grade II in the Bank's service on the day of his reversion. It for the purposes of this reference. It is admitted during cross examination by the workman as W.W. I that he had joined duty on promotion on 6-5-71 in Sharaffa Market Branch, Chandni Chowk, Delhi.

In the face of letter Ex. W/2 no other fact would be relevant. Shri M. L. Gupta would be an officer of Grade II in the officer cadre of the Bank at the time of reversion and I hold accordingly.

8. Having held that Shri M. L. Gupta was an officer at the time of his reversion it would follow automatically that no dispute could be raised in respect of reversion of said Shri M. L. Gupta by Shri M. L. Gupta or by the Union under the provisions of Industrial Dispute Act, 1947. My attention has been invited to Workmen Versus Dima Kuchi Tea Estate, 1958-1-ILLJ-500-1958-80-SC-353 and Workmen Versus Dahingepatu Tea Estate 1958-SC-1026 & All India Reserve Bank Employees' Association Versus Reserve Bank of India-1966-SC-305 on behalf of the workman side but the principle of law laid down in these rulings is not applicable to the present case. Even otherwise the principle laid down in these rulings was that the workmen can raise a dispute against their employer in respect of their employment or non employment of such persons who were not strictly speaking workmen but in which the workmen as a class had a direct or substantial interest. In the instant case no direct or substantial interest of the workmen as a class is involved in the continued employment of Shri M. L. Gupta as an Officer Grade II of the respondent-Bank and that being the position these rulings cannot be of any help to the case of Shri M. L. Gupta in the instant reference. No doubt that the dispute which can validly give rise to a reference under the Industrial Dispute Act need not necessarily be a dispute directly between the employer and its workmen but the workmen cannot take up a dispute in respect of a class of employees who are not workmen and in whose terms of employment those workmen have no 'direct interest' of their own. It is essential that the direct interest must not be a fanciful or remote interest but it must be a 'real and positive interest'. In the instant case Shri M. L. Gupta was promoted on probation as a Grade II officer of the Bank and later on when it was found that he was not a suitable person to be retained as an Officer he was reverted back by order Ex. M/10 and dated 5-10-1973. From the perusal of letter Ex. W/2 or Ex. M/1 it cannot be said that the workmen has a class had any interest what so ever in the continued employment of Shri M. L. Gupta as Head Shroff or in his reversion much less any direct interest and that being the position it cannot be held that the workman in the instant case had a right to raise the present dispute and it would follow that the present dispute does not qualify as an Industrial Dispute within the meaning of Section 2(k) of the Industrial Dispute Act.

9. Let us consider this matter from yet another angle. Suppose Shri M. L. Gupta had not been reverted and rather his services were terminated. Would it be in that event open to Shri M. L. Gupta or the Union to raise any dispute under the I.D. Act, 1947? The answer is obvious and it is that no such dispute could have been raised in the event of termination of the services of Shri M. L. Gupta as Head Shroff. How so ever arbitrary such a termination might have been. If such was the position with regard to his termination it can not be different with regard to reversion it is a different thing that it would be open to Shri M. L. Gupta to challenge his reversion in a different forum and under different provisions of law but he cannot have recourse to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947 to redress his grievances. My attention has not been drawn to any other ruling on behalf of the workman.

10. In view of my discussions above, issue no. 1 is decided in favour of the Management and against the workman and it is held that Shri M. L. Gupta was not a workman within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act for the purpose of this reference and it is further held that in so far as Shri M. L. Gupta was not a workman when he was reverted the present dispute does not qualify as an Industrial Dispute under section 2(k) of the I.D. Act and as such no reference could be made in respect of the matter under reference and the reference is invalid, incompetent and not maintainable. In view of my discussions and findings upon issue no. 1 I further hold that this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to go into the validity of the reversion of Shri M. L. Gupta under the I.D. Act, 1947 and accordingly it is awarded that Shri M. L. Gupta is not a workman within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for the purposes of this reference and as such the reference in the instant case is not competent and valid and the workman is not entitled to any relief. Parties however are left to bear their own costs.

Further Ordered.—That the requisite number of copies of this award may be sent to the appropriate Govt. for necessary action at their end.

Dated : the 24th November, 1980

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-12012/122/74-D.II(A)]

S.O. 81.—in pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th December, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI MAHESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 10 of 1980

In re : Camp : At Chandigarh.

The Dy. General Secretary, State Bank of India Staff Association (Regd.), 33, Bank Enclave, Rajouri Garden, Ring Road, New Delhi-110018.—Petitioner
Versus

The Regional Manager, Region III, State Bank of India, C. R. M. Office, Section—17, Chandigarh.—Respondent.

PRESENT :

None—for the workman.

Shri V. K. Gupta, Asstt. Law Officer of the Bank.

AWARD

The Central Government as appropriate Government vide its order No. L-12012/10/79/D.II.A dated the 23rd February, 1980 referred an Industrial Dispute u/s 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 in the following terms to this Tribunal :

Whether the action of the Management of State Bank of India (Region III), Chandigarh in stopping one annual increment with cumulative effect of Shri Suresh Kumar Chhabra, Clerk at Branch Office Hissar of the Bank is justified in view of the findings of the Enquiry Officer? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?

2. On receipt of the reference usual notions were sent to the parties in pursuance whereof statement of claim was filed by the workman side to which a written statement was filed by the Bank and finally a replication was filed on behalf of the Bank. The case was then adjourned for filing of documents by the parties but no documents were filed. Thereupon talks for compromise started between the parties and the case was adjourned to today. Today none has appeared for the workman side while Shri V. K. Gupta appeared for the Bank. In these circumstances ex-parte proceedings were ordered against the workman side and it was ordered that ex-parte evidence of the Bank be recorded. Rather than producing its ex-parte evidence Shri V. K. Gupta, the representative of the Bank came forward with the following statement :

Statement of Shri V. K. Gupta, representative of Bank on S.A.

'I tender into evidence the documents on record Ex. M/1 to Ex. M/6. In view the fact that bank has prepared to take lenient view of the matter bank has no objection to release the increment w.e.f. date of this award. Award releasing increment w.e.f. today be made. I close my evidence.'

3. I have given my considered thought to the matter before me and after hearing Shri Gupta, I have come to the following findings :

4 The contention of the workman in this case is that he was punished with stoppage of one increment with cumu-

lative effect on account of some alleged misconduct which stoppage was not justified. On the contrary it has been urged on behalf of the Bank that the punishment of stoppage of one increment with cumulative effect was imposed upon the workman after requisite show cause notice and charge sheet. The documents have been tendered into evidence by Shri Gupta. From the perusal of the documents produced on record I find that Ex. M/6 is the findings of the Enquiry Officer. From last para thereof I find that the Enquiry Officer had come to the conclusion that the Bank has not been able to prove beyond doubt that the instrument was lost from the custody of the employee. On the other hand it appears to have been misplaced from the section. Accordingly, I exonerate the employee from the charge levelled against him.' In the face of this finding for the Regional Manager to still inflict the punishment upon the workman. The action of the Regional Manager in inflicting the punishment in spite of exonerating of the employee by the Enquiry Officer is against all canons of natural justice and no case has been made out on behalf of the Bank so as to enable me to hold that the order of Regional Manager was justified. In view thereof I come to the conclusion that the action of the Management of State Bank of India, Region III, Chandigarh in stopping one annual increment with cumulative effect of Shri Suresh Kumar Chhabra, clerk at Branch Office Hissar of the Bank is not justified and he is entitled to be restored his increment and accordingly the increment is restored from the date it would have otherwise fallen due. Accordingly it is awarded that the increment of the workman is restored from the date it would have normally fallen due and he would also be entitled to the arrears of his wages as a consequence of release of his increment. There is no order as to costs as the order is ex-parte.

Further Ordered.—That requisite number of copies of this award may be sent to the appropriate Govt. for necessary action at their end.

Dated : the 29th November, 1980 (At Chandigarh).

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-12012/10/79-D.II(A)]

S.O. 82.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Bank of India, Madras and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th December, 1980.

BEFORE THIRU T. SUDARSANAM DANIEL B.A., B.L.
PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
MADRAS.

(Constituted by the Government of India)
Thursday, the 20th day of November, 1980

Industrial Dispute No. 68 of 1980

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workmen and the Management of Central Bank of India, Madras-6.)

BETWEEN

The workmen represented by :

The General Secretary, Central Bank of India Staff Union, No. 1, P. Subramaniam Road, T. Nagar, Madras-17.

AND

The Assistant General Manager, Central Bank of India, 159, Greaves Road, Madras-6.

REFERENCE :

Order No. L-12011/74/79-D.IIA, dated 20-9-1980 of the Ministry of Labour Government of India

This dispute coming on this day for final disposal in the presence of Thiru P. Sundara Sivudu, President of the Union for workmen and of Thiruvalargal S. Sampath Kumar and V. Balasubramanian, Advocates for the Management upon perusing the reference and all other papers connected to this

dispute and the President of the Union having filed a memorandum that this reference may be cancelled and recording the same, this Tribunal made the following.

AWARD

This is an Industrial Dispute between the workmen and the Management of Central Bank of India, Madras referred to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Government of India in Order No. 1-12011/74/79-D.II A, dated 20-9-1980 of the Ministry of Labour, in respect of the following issue :

"Whether the action of the management of Central Bank of India in relation to their Branch at Madras, in not treating Shri P. Selvaraj (appointed 1-12-75) on probation with effect from their dates of appointment and in not confirming them after the expiry of probationary periods, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

(2) Parties were served with summons. The case was posted to 7-10-1980 for filing claim statement. The Union representative took time till 30-10-1980 for filing claim statement. Then time was extended for filing claim statement to 20-11-1980.

(3) Today, when the dispute was called, no claim statement has been filed. But the Union representative filed a memorandum that in view of the representation made by the Union to the Government regarding some discrepancy in the order of reference in this dispute, a fresh reference was issued to this Tribunal which has been taken on file under I.D. No. 83 of 1980 and that in view of the fresh reference in I.D. No. 83 of 1980, the reference in this dispute may be cancelled.

(4) In view of the memo filed by the Union and the fact that this reference has been cancelled by the Government of India in a subsequent reference which form I.D. No. 83 of 1980 on the file of this Tribunal, Award is passed closing the reference. No cost.

Dated, this 20th day of November, 1980.

F. SUDARSANAM DANIEL, Presiding Officer

[No. L-12011(74)/79-D.II(A)]

S. K. BISWAS, Desk Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर 1980

का० आ० 83 --केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि लोकहित में ऐसा करना अपेक्षित था, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947

(1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के उपखंड (IV) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1820 तारीख 23 जून, 1980 द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 2 के खंड (ख) में यथापरिभाषित बैंकिंग कंपनी द्वारा चलाए जा रहे बैंकिंग उद्योग की उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिये 29 जून, 1980 से छ मास की कालावधि के लिये लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया था ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में उक्त कालावधि को छ मास की और कालावधि के लिये बढ़ाया जाना अपेक्षित है ,

अतः अद्य, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के उपखंड (IV) के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त उद्योग का उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 29 दिसम्बर, 1980 से छ मास का और कालावधि के लिये लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है ।

[फाइल सं० एम० 11017/11/79-आ०](ए.)]

ए० के० नारायणन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 1980

S.O. 83.—Whereas the Central Government having been satisfied that the public interest so required had, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), declared by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S. O. 1820 dated the 23rd June, 1980 the Banking Industry carried on by a Banking Company, as defined in clause (b) of section 2 of the said Act to be a public utility service for the purpose of the said Act, for a period of six months, from the 29th June, 1980;

And whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a further period of six months from the 29th December, 1980.

[F. No. S-11017/11/79-D. I. (A.)]

L. K. NARAYANAN, Under Secy.